

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. William Edward Lucas, Jr., Infantry, from January 9, 1939.

To be majors

Capt. Herbert Joseph McChrystal, Infantry, from January 8, 1939.

Capt. Aubrey Casey Strickland, Air Corps (temporary major, Air Corps), from January 9, 1939.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be captain

First Lt. Frank Arnold Todd, Veterinary Corps, from December 1, 1938.

AIR CORPS

To be captains with rank from February 2, 1939

First Lt. Robert Edward Lee Pirtle, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Wilbur Erickson, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Lilburn Dimmitt Fator, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Archibald Meyer Kelley, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Ralph Orville Brownfield, Air Corps, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lt. Joel Edward Mallory, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Donald Russell Lyon, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Warren Herbert Higgins, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Stanley Keith Robinson, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Willard Reno Shephard, Air Corps.
 First Lt. George Washington Hansen, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Minton William Kaye, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Aubrey Lee Moore, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Ronald Roosevelt Walker, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Lloyd Harrison Tull, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Francis Marion Zeigler, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Frederic Ernst Glantzberg, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Eugene Herbert Rice, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Leland Samuel Stranathan, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Ernest Keeling Warburton, Air Corps.
 First Lt. LeRoy Hudson, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Roland Ogdan Strand Akre, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Paul Ellis Shanahan, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Roger Vincent Williams, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Frederick Archibald Pillet, Air Corps, subject to examination required by law.
 First Lt. William Hugh McArthur, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Reginald Heber, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Homer LeRoy Sanders, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Draper Frew Henry, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Robert Dilger Johnston, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Walter Robertson Agee, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Hansford Wesley Pennington, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Guy Frost Hix, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Murray Clarke Woodbury, Air Corps.
 First Lt. Paul Bernard Wurtsmith, Air Corps.
 First Lt. William Alexander Robert Robertson, Air Corps.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Thursday, January 12, 1939

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

John W. Hanes to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Preston Delano to be Comptroller of the Currency.

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Ellen S. Woodward to be a member of the Social Security Board.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

James P. Pope to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE SURGEONS

William W. Nesbit
 John R. Murdock

Joseph F. Van Ackeren
 Roy R. Jones

Elmer A. Carberry
 Anthony P. Rubino

Jacob P. Eberhardt
 Mark P. Schultz

TO BE ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON

Bruce D. Forsyth

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Harold Martin Graning	Murray Allen Diamond
Vernam Terrell Davis	Max Rudolph Kiesselbach
Karl Habel	James Allen Grider, Jr.
Francis Theodore Zinn	Frank Lewis Price
Ralph Erhart Wenzel	Weldon Algenon Williamson
Robert Tedford Hewitt	Robert Dean Wright
Lawrence William Brown	Aaron William Christensen
Harold Tycho Castberg	Carl Vincent Morrison
Robert Roland Smith	Nobel W. Guthrie
Donald Roland Auten	

TO BE SANITARY ENGINEERS

Judson L. Robertson, Jr.	John J. Bloomfield
Charles T. Wright	Henry A. Johnson

TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR

Grover A. Kempf

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Eric C. Johnson	William E. Graham
Erwin C. Drescher	Jonathan Zoole
John B. Hozier	Eugene W. Green
Virgil J. Dorset	Fred J. Black
Earl L. White	Hugh L. C. Wilkerson
Curtis R. Chaffin	Charles F. Blankenship
Paul T. Erickson	

TO BE SENIOR SURGEONS

Lynne A. Fullerton
 Ralph E. Porter
 Joseph W. Mountin

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON

Bruce D. Forsyth

TO BE SURGEONS

Frank S. Fellows
 Ralph B. Snavelly
 William Hendon Gordon

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Albert Gallatin Love, Jr.	John Patrick Turner
Waldron Morton Sennott	Walter Eugene Sharpe
Kenneth Martin Joye	

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON

Frederick J. Krueger

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

NOTE.—For the entire list of persons nominated to appointment to or promotion in the Navy, which were confirmed today, see under Nominations in the Navy, appearing on page 110 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 5, 1939.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 1939

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

As we wait at Thy footstool, our Heavenly Father, may prayer be the breath of our souls. We pray that we may be prepared for the work of life, for the busy crowd, for the fields of commerce, for the vicissitudes of defeat, and for the experience of sorrow. Teach us, O Lord, the spirit of charity for the views not our own, for human wants and needs. Oh, teach us that whosoever excludes his brother is not a disciple of Thine. Fill us with the joy of helping the jaded, the rapture of saving the fallen, the thrill of appeasing the desert hunger. Blessed Lord, do Thou so establish our hearts, thus making us gentle and generous with our fellows. Light our candle; may we see the bow in the cloud. Herein is the Christ with open heart and mind, sweet in comfort and divine in compassion. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, two of my colleagues from Illinois who were unable to be sworn in on the first day of the session due to other official duties are now present, and I ask that they now be sworn.

Mr. MARTIN of Illinois and Mr. MACIEJEWSKI appeared in the Well of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the arrest of the American seaman, George Roth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by me at a Jackson Day dinner in New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by incorporating therein a radio speech which I recently made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by me at a dinner in New York yesterday evening in honor of Alexander Hamilton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and the legislative program of the day, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech delivered by Judge Martin Conboy, of New York, on American neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

ADOPTION OF FUNDAMENTAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my thought that freshmen should be heard on rare occasions only. The importance of the anniversary to which I will refer, however, justifies my taking a few minutes of the time of this House.

On Saturday next, January 14, the residents of my district will observe the three hundredth anniversary of the adoption of the Fundamental Orders by the people of Hartford, Windsor, and Wethersfield, the latter being the town in which I reside.

At a time when the world is filled with the conflict of isms, when the man in the street is baffled by the smooth harangue of propagandists and counter-propagandists, it is refreshing to be able to reach back through the years and take courage from the clear, right-minded thinking of our forefathers.

As a Representative from the Constitution State, I ask your recognition of the important place Connecticut has had in the development of our vast governmental theme. On the

14th of January 1639, 300 years ago, the people of the towns of Hartford, Windsor, and Wethersfield, in Connecticut Colony, adopted a set of 11 Rules for Government, under the title of "The Fundamental Orders" and agreed to live by their force. To quote from their preamble:

Well knowing where a people are gathered together, the Word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such people there should be an orderly and decent Government established according to God, to order and dispose of the affairs of the people at all seasons as occasion shall require.

These 11 rules, regulating the election of officers and the setting up of a general court or legislature for the making and repealing of laws, are the first written constitution known to history that created a government, the beginning of American democracy. It is noteworthy that these Fundamental Orders set up a federation of independent towns and that all attributes of sovereignty not expressly granted to the general court remained, as of original right, in the towns. The people of Connecticut Colony, through the establishment of a representative government and the adoption of a constitution, definitely set bounds upon the authority which they gave to the heads of their government and thereby established not only a right but a duty to insist that those bounds be observed until changed precisely in the way the constitution permits.

The American Government of today is a vast, complex machine, at times cumbersome, at times bewildering, but at all times, we hope, dedicated to the people from whom it has its being. This same Government is in lineal descent more nearly related to that of Connecticut than to that of any of the other Thirteen Colonies. May we pause now to reflect whether or not we have made the most of our heritage; whether or not we have allowed the simple, sincere democracy of the Fundamental Orders to become clouded with the accumulation of years. Are we drifting away from popular government to one so complex, so filled with agencies, bureaus, and committees as to be extrapopular, a supermachine regulating the people rather than being regulated by the people? Are we clogging the machinery of true democracy with surplus legislation in a frantic attempt to preserve that which our increased efforts only tend to destroy? Or are we going to be guided by the simple wisdom of the Fundamental Orders which sought to govern for the benefit of all rather than for the joy of governing?

Three hundred years ago the ideal which gave birth to the Fundamental Orders was the ideal of representative government, practical working politics of the people. May we, 300 years later, affirm that ideal as worthy of preservation. I ask you, therefore, to recognize the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut not as an ancestor of our Government, dead these 300 years, but rather as a parent, alive and exhorting its offspring to walk wisely in the paths of liberty and democracy. [Applause.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado reported the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit minority views and ask that they may be printed with the majority report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order there is not a quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-seven Members present, a quorum.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on

the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 83, with Mr. WARREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 83

Resolved, etc., That in order to continue to provide work relief on useful public projects; and relief, as authorized in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938, and subject to all of the provisions of such act, there is hereby appropriated to the Works Progress Administration, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$725,000,000, which amount shall be added to the \$1,425,000,000 appropriated to that Administration in section 1, subsection 1, of such Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938 and shall proportionately increase the amounts specified in limitations (1); (2); and (3), of (d) of subsection (1) of section 1 of such act: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 2 of such act prescribing February 28, 1939, as the end of the period over which the funds appropriated to the Works Progress Administration shall be apportioned and distributed are hereby amended so as to prescribe June 30, 1939, as the end of such period: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any of the provisions of section 2 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938, the amount herein appropriated shall be so apportioned by the Works Progress Administration as to cover the entire period from the date of the approval of this act until June 30, 1939: *Provided further*, That the limitation of \$60,000,000 in section 3 of such act, on the amount that may be allocated to other Federal departments, establishments, and agencies is hereby increased to \$83,000,000: *Provided further*, That the words "and prior to February 28, 1939," are hereby deleted from section 23 of such act: *Provided further*, That the provisions of Executive Order No. 7916, dated June 24, 1938, shall not apply to positions the compensation of which is payable from appropriations contained in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938 or from the amount appropriated in this joint resolution, and such appropriations shall not be available for the compensation of the incumbent of any position placed in the competitive classified civil service of the United States after January 10, 1939.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, when will it be in order to offer amendments to the resolution?

The CHAIRMAN. After 2 o'clock tomorrow, Friday, January 13.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 83, which is now before the Committee for consideration, is for the purpose of providing additional funds for the Works Progress Administration for the remainder of the fiscal year. I shall undertake to give a very brief description of the resolution. As reported by the Appropriations Committee, it provides for \$725,000,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year, covering a period from February 6 to June 30, 1939. Those funds are available to the Works Progress Administration under the same terms and provisions of the original relief act of 1938, under which Works Progress Administration is now operating, with the exception that the amount available for Federal projects is proportionately increased—an immaterial and noncontroversial change in the bill—and with a further provision added that undertakes to prevent the supervisory personnel of the Works Progress Administration from being covered into the classified civil service under the terms and provisions of the Executive order of June 24, 1938.

CIVIL SERVICE

It will be recalled that on that date the President issued a general Executive order covering into the classified civil service certain establishments of the Government, not by name, but by description, leaving it to the Civil Service Commission to name the agencies and to carry that into effect. The purpose of the language inserted in the resolution is to prevent, certainly for the time being, these 37,000 supervisory personnel of the Works Progress Administration from

being covered into the classified civil service. The evidence before the committee showed that some 2,000 of these people are in the Department in Washington, and some 35,000 in the field offices. I think the reason for the language is obvious. Some of us entertain the hope that the Works Progress Administration will some day, when business and industry have been able to take up certainly a large part of the slack of unemployment, find itself with nothing to do. [Applause.] Maybe that is an illusion, maybe it is a vain hope, but certainly we would not be justified in denying ourselves the benefit of that hope, and certainly we would not wish to place in the way of ultimate liquidation of the Works Progress Administration an army of 37,000 civil-service employees. So, without casting any aspersions upon anyone, for many of that army of people are faithful public servants, the committee did not feel that in such a hasty manner they should be added permanently to the personnel of the United States Government.

In considering the relief problem as it is now presented to the Congress I think there are a few things that we should bear in mind in order to keep our bearings. The first is that never have we undertaken to provide jobs for all of the unemployed. It is well to remember that. When someone tells us that any reduction in the Budget estimate of \$875,000,000 will throw people out of jobs, let us remember that even at the height of unemployment, variously estimated at from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000, the Federal Government has never undertaken to provide work for more than a little over 3,000,000 of the unemployed, leaving it to industry and business and commerce to take care of the rest of the load. This reduction of \$150,000,000 from the Budget estimate of \$875,000,000 will unquestionably cause a reduction in the employment of W. P. A. We realize that and we think it should be done—not to cause suffering and want, not to throw people out of jobs, but to exert all the while, if we may, persuasion, and force if necessary, upon business and industry to take up the slack, as well as upon employees on W. P. A. to seek other employment when they can find it. This appropriation will provide during these 5 months for an average employment of something more than 2,000,000 people. It will cause an average reduction in W. P. A. rolls of between 450,000 and 550,000 during that period of time.

Another thing we should remember in considering this is that several years ago the Federal Government changed its policy with reference to relief, and withdrew entirely, so far as W. P. A. is concerned, from the field of direct relief. The program of W. P. A. is a work-relief program, supposed to carry on its rolls employable people.

TAXPAYER PAYS THE BILL

Another thing that we should bear in mind is that, while the funds come out of the Federal Treasury, they come ultimately out of the pockets of the taxpayers of America, and he who figures that if he can get these people on the Federal rolls local taxpayers are thereby relieved of the burden is a shortsighted mathematician. Every laboring man as he carries his dinner pail to his work, every farmer as he tills his field, every housewife as she carried her basket to the market, every citizen will, directly or indirectly, contribute to these funds that ultimately go into the Federal Treasury to make up the funds out of which this appropriation is taken.

Another thing that we should remember, in order to keep our bearings, is that what we are appropriating, we are going to have to borrow. It is very easy to be very generous, very liberal, and very provident when we have a big roll of money in our pockets, but when we are going to have to go down to the bank and borrow what we are using, it is sometimes a different situation, if we will bear that in mind.

W. P. A. SHOULD BE REDUCED

All of these considerations have led the Committee on Appropriations to believe that Congress should take a very definite stand in showing to the country and to W. P. A. that it looks with great encouragement upon this period of business improvement, and that its ultimate objective is going

to be that people on W. P. A. will find private employment and will not be permanently upon the rolls of the Federal Government.

We are told in these hearings by officials of the W. P. A. that it is conservatively expected there will be a million and a half new jobs for American citizens between February 1 and July 1. Our committee received that information with great encouragement. We therefore concluded that if there are to be a million and a half new jobs furnished by business and industry, certainly the time is coming, if it ever will come, when there can be some reduction in W. P. A. rolls.

In addition to this money that is being spent by the W. P. A. for work relief, do not forget the fact that the Federal Government, in many other fields of endeavor, is extending the helpful hand to its indigent and its needy citizens. The National Youth Administration has for expenditure \$275,000,000 for this fiscal year. The Federal public buildings program, the Public Works Administration, estimated that they would take care of a million of the unemployed people. A million jobs during this fiscal year. The Civilian Conservation Corps 300,000. The Navy building program is just getting under way. Also the national-defense program, which will shortly be before us. I have a very interesting statement which under leave which I will later secure, I will put into the RECORD, showing that this reduction in W. P. A. rolls, while it will decrease during this 5 months' period the monthly expenditure for W. P. A., yet the public-works program just getting under way does increase the expenditure more than sufficient to offset the decrease from W. P. A.

Expenditures

Month	Under estimate of \$875,000,000	Under committee proposal of \$725,000,000	Decrease	Increase projected in Public Works Administration expenditures
February.....	\$183,000,000	\$170,800,000	\$12,200,000	\$16,100,000
March.....	183,000,000	158,600,000	24,400,000	31,200,000
April.....	175,375,000	146,400,000	28,975,000	37,500,000
May.....	169,275,000	134,200,000	35,075,000	26,999,207
June.....	164,700,000	122,000,000	42,700,000	6,501,000
Total.....	875,350,000	732,000,000	143,350,000	118,300,207

So there is no merit in the argument that a reasonable decrease in W. P. A. expenditures is going to cut down the purchasing power of the American people. For instance, as shown in the table under the estimate of \$875,000,000, W. P. A. would spend in February \$183,000,000. Under the \$725,000,000 appropriation, if it is enacted, it would spend \$170,800,000, or a decrease under W. P. A. of \$12,200,000.

The Public Works Administration will increase its monthly expenditures in February by \$16,100,000, because, as we know, its program is just getting under way, and the expenditures of Public Works are just beginning to flow out of the Treasury.

In March the decrease would be \$24,400,000 under W. P. A. The increase under P. W. A. is \$31,200,000. In April the decrease under W. P. A. is \$28,975,000. The increase under P. W. A. is \$37,500,000. So on over this period.

It seems to me it is fundamentally sound public policy and logical reasoning that as public expenditures go out for the creation of jobs and for the employment of people under Public Works Administration and other agencies, we should decrease somewhat proportionately employment under W. P. A.

Now, how can we reduce the rolls of W. P. A. without causing sorrow and suffering? I have no sympathy for the melodramatic manner in which this matter is sometimes considered, in which it is immediately assumed that because a less amount is to be appropriated, somebody is going to starve to death out in the public square. There may be a great difference of opinion in this body and in the Nation about the manner in which this very troublesome and very perplexing problem should be handled, but I do not think there is any difference of opinion about the fact that nobody wants to see

an American citizen actually suffer for the want of food, clothing, and shelter. None of us wants to see such a tragedy. Our objective is to obviate that and to relieve such a contingency.

I believe I can demonstrate that the rolls of W. P. A. can be reduced four or five hundred thousand in the next 6 months without causing any deserving person to actually suffer. How can it be done? In the first place, it is very reasonable to assume that business and industry, in the creation of these million and a half new jobs, is going to take some people from the W. P. A. We should be able to assume that. We have heard so much complaint from business and industry that if just given a little encouragement and a little chance, they will do marvelous things in the way of expansion and reemployment. If this bill is passed, here is an opportunity to see whether that is a lot of "hoovey" or whether they are deeply in earnest in trying to help take up the slack in unemployment, and thus make it possible for the Government to withdraw from this field. Here is an invitation by Congress to business and industry to help take up this load.

LIMIT W. P. A. EMPLOYMENT

The second point is this: We are told that among these 3,000,000 W. P. A. enrollees the W. P. A. estimates that 10 percent, or 300,000, have been on the rolls since the first day W. P. A. opened for business. Personally, I think—and I believe it is your experience—that the percentage is very much larger than 10 percent; but if 300,000 employable citizens have remained on W. P. A. for 3½ or 4 years, I do not think it would be a hardship, after reasonable notice, 30 or 60 or 90 days or 6 months—any reasonable notice—to say to those gentlemen, "If the Government has given you a job for 3½ or 4 years, and as we cannot give a job to everybody, you must stand aside and give other deserving people an opportunity."

There should be a limitation, a reasonable, human limitation, upon W. P. A. enrollment. The evidence showed our committee that there had never been any comprehensive or dependable resurvey made by the Federal Government of these various relief rolls all over the country. Localities make up the eligibility for the W. P. A. and the Federal Government has just left it to localities to determine who are eligible. As a result it has been my experience and yours that many people upon W. P. A. have secured positions there and are content to stay there as long as they will be permitted to stay. I believe hundreds of thousands of W. P. A. people could be removed from those rolls. Their status often has changed, other people in the family have gotten positions, and I believe a large turn-over in W. P. A. might be found to help take up this small reduction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

UNEMPLOYABLES

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In addition to that, there are certain types of projects that I think could be eliminated by W. P. A. Furthermore, bear in mind that the W. P. A. program is a work-relief program to give jobs to employable people. I feel perfectly confident, and I believe it is your experience also, that there are literally hundreds of thousands of people enrolled on W. P. A. who are really unemployable people. The W. P. A. has had to make jobs for them.

Now, gentlemen, let us try to be logical. No one wants to see an aged person suffer, no one wants to see an old man or an aged woman turned off from some sort of hand-made project in W. P. A. that we are pleased to call work, and put out in the street; but this is a work-relief program, and under the policy of the Federal Government my city and your city, my district and your district is supposed to take care of its unemployable people. That is their burden; that is their part of this program. Unemployable people ought to be taken care of by localities, by cities, and by States. They have no place upon this program, which is a work-relief

program. I feel perfectly confident that if the W. P. A. administration approaches the problem from this angle that they will be able to reduce their rolls substantially and that the whole program will look better and be better, that it will more nearly accomplish its objectives, and that there need not be any great suffering among the American people.

THE BUDGET

There is another consideration, and I put it last because it is last, but it is, nonetheless, a consideration. The party to which I belong made some pretty definite promises to the American people about trying to balance the Federal Budget. Members of this House who were here in the spring of 1933 will remember a certain piece of legislation called a bill to maintain the credit of the United States. Why, the national debt was \$21,000,000,000. Think of it. We had an accumulated deficit of \$5,000,000,000, we had a Budget of \$7,000,000,000; and the credit of the Nation was in jeopardy. Our great President sent a ringing message to the Congress. I quote a part of it. It was true then, and it is true today. Never in his great career did he utter a greater truth than that embodied in this message. In the language of the streets, he "sold me a bill of goods" that day, and I have stuck to it, or tried to, although it has been tough going sometimes. Here is what the President said:

For 3 long years the Federal Government has been on the road toward bankruptcy.

For the fiscal year 1931 the deficit was \$462,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1932 it was \$2,472,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1933 it will probably exceed \$1,200,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1934, based on the appropriation bills passed by the last Congress and the estimated revenues, the deficit will probably exceed \$1,000,000,000, unless immediate action is taken.

Thus we shall have piled up an accumulated deficit of \$5,000,000,000.

With the utmost seriousness I point out to the Congress the profound effect of this fact upon our national economy. It has contributed to the recent collapse of our banking structure. It has accentuated the stagnation of the economic life of our people. It has added to the ranks of the unemployed. Our Government's house is not in order, and for many reasons no effective action has been taken to restore it to order.

Upon the unimpaired credit of the United States Government rest the safety of deposits, the security of insurance policies, the activity of industrial enterprises, the value of our agricultural products, and the availability of employment. The credit of the United States Government definitely affects these fundamental human values. It therefore becomes our first concern to make secure the foundation. National recovery depends upon it.

Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger.

It is too late for a leisurely approach to this problem. We must not wait to act several months hence. The emergency is accentuated by the necessity of meeting great refunding operations this spring.

We must move with a direct and resolute purpose now. The Members of the Congress and I are pledged to immediate economy.

That is what our President said in 1933. I believe that that is his philosophy of government today. It certainly is mine. It has been mine from that day to this, as my record in this House will show.

I have persistently advocated a reduction in Federal expenditures and a serious and determined effort to balance the Budget of the Federal Government. I recognized the necessity, during the period of the so-called depression, for the expenditure of large outlays of Federal funds for the purpose of meeting relief needs and stimulating recovery and have consistently supported the President's program in that regard. But I have never subscribed to that school of thought that lavish public spending was sound business judgment or the way to economic stability.

Before the inauguration of President Roosevelt I took a stand on this matter which I have never abandoned, and to clarify the record I want to quote briefly from an address I made in this body on the 29th of December 1932, which is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the second session of the Seventy-second Congress, part 1, page 1067:

In my judgment, there is only one logical way to balance the Federal Budget, and that is in the way we are doing it now, and not in the way we did it in the last session of Congress. At the last session of Congress we worked on a revenue bill first, and my complaint was that we were putting the cart before the horse; that the first duty of the legislative body was to try to cut Federal expenditures as low as they could possibly be reduced without

impairing necessary functions of government, and then to raise enough revenue to run the Government. The Government has got to operate. We cannot cease functioning. We have got to have enough revenue to pay the bill; but the first duty of Congress is to see how low it can get the bill, and raise additional revenue as a last resort. That is the program of Governor Roosevelt, as I understand it. The press reports him as saying that he believes the way to balance the Budget is to reduce public expenditures to the lowest possible level and then raise sufficient revenue to pay the bill, meet the expenses of the Government, and that is what Congress is doing now.

On March 30, 1937, I addressed the House at length upon the subject, and take the liberty of quoting a few brief paragraphs from that address:

We have come now to another cycle in this campaign of progress. If we would perpetuate these splendid victories, if we would preserve this equality that we have approximated for our agricultural population, if we would perpetuate this new opportunity that we have given to the laboring people of the country, if we would make steadfast the new security that we have brought to the aged and infirm, if we would try to carry on the opportunities for education and advancement that we have afforded to the youth of our country, then we must with steadfast determination, from now on, speed to the task of achieving another objective which has been delayed of necessity—and that the one which calls for a more even balance between our income and our public expenditures.

In sounding this note I would not wish to suggest for a moment that we retreat from these splendid undertakings or abandon this splendid new service which this Government, under its enlightened leadership, is bringing to our people. Many of these emergency functions properly belong to the States and municipalities; but the Federal Government of sheer necessity had to take them up.

With a return to approximately normal conditions then unquestionably again States and municipalities should move prominently and aggressively into the center of this picture, and the Federal Government, in many instances, should move out.

But here again we could not stand on form and ceremony. The job had to be done, and it had to be done quickly. But we are a foolish people if we seek to blind our eyes to the fact that we cannot go on for an indefinite period without regard to the mounting cost of Government. We cannot continue to borrow and spend and spend and borrow unless we are reconciled to meet head-on some day the fiddler when he comes to collect his pay, and come he surely will.

Again, as late as January 24, 1938, I called upon Congress to set our financial house in order, and expressed in that address the very earnest hope that Congress would re-assume its legislative prerogative in the matter of appropriations.

BALANCED BUDGET—AT WHAT FIGURE?

Our public thinking upon the subject of a balanced Budget has, it seems to me, usually gone from one extreme to another. One school of thought demands that the Budget be balanced and that public expenditures be brought back to the level of predepression times. This cannot be done. No administration during these past few tragic years would have dared undertake to have held its expenditures to the point of their budgetary requirements before the advent of these humanitarian enterprises for which this administration can take due and just credit.

The other extreme of this school of thought is that we may rush on appropriating and spending without increasing our revenue and with no alarm over the increased national debt, and perhaps sometime, somewhere, somehow, a fairy godmother will wave a magic wand and pour a cornucopia of great wealth into our lap from which we may pay for our improvidence. I do not subscribe to that. As stated before this House on March 7, 1938, I believe that our Nation will be called upon to meet an annual budget of between seven and nine billion dollars. It should be nearer \$7,000,000,000. A return of prosperity and an increase of national income will automatically increase our revenue. As a legislative body we have two duties to perform. One is to hold down these public expenditures to prevent an increase in our Budget, to liquidate unnecessary functions of Government, whenever possible, and as a last resort, to find the required revenue to bring our receipts and expenditures nearer in balance.

As the RECORD will show, I have supported the President consistently in his great humanitarian enterprises. I believe that except for his humanitarian leadership there would have been untold sorrow and suffering in this Nation, and, as I have said, I am perfectly willing to admit that the exigencies of the occasion called for large and unprecedented outlays of

public funds. We are told now, however, that the sky has a roseate hue, that business and industry is on the upgrade, that things are adjusting themselves, and that if given a little encouragement we may yet approach a situation where our expenditures and our income somewhat more nearly are in line and in balance. To my mind, the Congress of the United States can do no more constructive thing than to try to hasten that day, not at the expense of misery and suffering, but in a logical, orderly, sensible, businesslike manner, fearless and heedless of the political consequences. My constituents and your constituents sent us here to represent the people of the United States, and speaking to my side of the aisle, if I may, for a moment, I want to say to you, my colleagues, that the people of America expect our party sometime, somewhere, somehow, to show an inclination to redeem campaign promises that we have made to the American people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman give us a brief explanation of what is meant by the following language?—

Provided further, That the limitation of \$60,000,000 in section 3 of such act on the amount that may be allocated to other Federal departments—

And so forth—

is hereby increased to \$83,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. In the original relief act we earmarked not to exceed \$60,000,000 to be used for projects sponsored by the Federal Government. That was on the basis of a total expenditure of \$1,425,000,000 over that period of time. We merely provide for a proportionate increase in that limitation.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is it not a fact there never has been a bill introduced providing for an expenditure of \$875,000,000? That was nothing but a Budget estimate, on which the committee had hearings.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think such a bill was introduced yesterday, but the bill reported by the subcommittee and the bill reported by the full committee is the same as this House joint resolution, which provides for \$725,000,000.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Has the gentleman any information as to what the additional cost would be, if any, if these 37,000 W. P. A. officials and administrative employees were blanketed into the civil service?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We were told in the hearings there would not be an appreciable additional cost. That is what we were told in the hearings.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. In the joint resolution it states that this appropriation of \$725,000,000 shall be added to the \$1,425,000,000 heretofore appropriated. How much of that amount heretofore appropriated remains unexpended?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, there is a carry-over in W. P. A. from month to month. They obligate, but they will have no funds after February 6 for obligations unless additional funds are made available.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman tell the House how much of this money will go for new work and how much will go to complete work already begun?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not have that figure.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is undoubtedly aware of the cuts that took place from December 1936 to December 1937 in monthly W. P. A. expenditures. Is the gentleman ready to tell us what followed with regard to business and production in the year 1938 after these cuts in W. P. A. expenditures?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. What happened to business and industry is a familiar story. I would not be willing to admit to the gentleman that the W. P. A. cuts were responsible for all of that, however.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is the gentleman ready to admit that the W. P. A. cuts influenced a decline in business rather than an increase?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If not compensated for in some other way; but I believe the P. W. A. expenditures will more than compensate for it, according to the schedule which I just read into the Record.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. The gentleman has stated that the amount recommended by the committee is a decrease in the amount requested by the W. P. A. The gentleman has further stated that will mean slashing the W. P. A. rolls to the extent of 500,000 people.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HEALEY. Does the gentleman have any hope that those people who will be cut from the W. P. A. rolls will be absorbed in an increase in private employment and the other governmental agencies?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know whether the gentleman was in the Chamber when I made my statement, but I undertook to outline how I thought that would be made up. I think it is reasonable to suppose that some of it will be taken up in industry. A lot of it can be taken up by purging the W. P. A. rolls.

Mr. HEALEY. Is the decrease in the amount recommended by the committee based on any scientific analysis, or is it just a slash which has no logical reason?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I have given a scientific discussion of the matter.

Mr. HEALEY. I listened to the gentleman, but I have not yet reached a conclusion that he has proved any logical reason for such slash. That is, the gentleman has not added up any figures.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, I cannot be responsible for my friend's inability to follow me on that.

Mr. HEALEY. I followed the gentleman very closely.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. We in New York are very much interested in the Federal art project. Will the gentleman tell us what effect this reduction will have on the employables in that project?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it will have a proportionate effect on it, I may say to the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly it will proportionately hit the art project as it will hit other projects.

Mr. CELLER. Will the decrease be to a greater degree or a lesser degree in the Federal art project or in the so-called white-collar class?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That will be entirely an administrative function.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman, of course, appreciates that the Members of the House have great respect for the findings of his committee. Personally, I think it is the finest group of legislators who have served in this House during my 14

years here. I know that the gentleman has stood for economy all along, and I have great confidence in his findings.

I am wondering what the gentleman's attitude would be in regard to an effort to reduce this sum from \$725,000,000 to around \$500,000,000, as a more emphatic evidence of an intention on the part of this House to legislate in a business-like and sensible manner, having in mind a regard for the good of the country.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think any reduction below the amount reported by the committee would be reaching a danger point. Whatever our idea of the W. P. A. or the Federal Government may be as far as carrying this unemployment load is concerned, there is a stark realism about it. These people have to be taken care of. The matter cannot be disposed of precipitately or with emotion. It must be carefully and logically done. I would not want and I do not believe the Congress would want to take the responsibility of acting precipitately in the matter. I believe that is about as low as it can be cut, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman in his clear and understandable statement said there was a prospect of business giving employment to a million and a half people. I presume the gentleman had in mind a million and a half of our own nationals? Would there be resistance on the part of the committee to writing into the resolution a provision making it certain that our own nationals get such jobs?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is in the original bill a provision which applies to this, I may say to the gentleman. There is in the original bill an alien amendment, offered by our colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] which applies also to this fund.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I believe the gentleman has well and ably defended the committee's action in bringing in this resolution, but I should like to ask the gentleman whether or not the committee considered the advisability of inserting in the resolution a provision which would bring about a purging of the W. P. A. rolls such as the gentleman discussed in his speech?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee considered it and discussed it in the hearings with the W. P. A. administration.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman hold out any hope that the rolls will be purged in the manner suggested?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do hold out a hope for that, because without any reflection whatever upon the previous Works Progress Administration Administrator, I may say that the distinguished gentleman who now heads the organization is very capable and very earnest, and I think we may have every reason to believe that such reductions will be made with thought and care in order to give the work to the people who need it the most and that there will be a resurvey and a repurging of the rolls.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask one other question? Did the gentleman state that in his opinion, after holding hearings on this bill, it would not be advisable to reduce the amount of \$725,000,000 to a lesser amount?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not think it can be reduced in the near future. I hold high hope that, with this reduction, in the fiscal year 1940 we can make still further reductions in the appropriation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I recall that the appropriation of \$1,425,000,000 last year was intended to cover the entire fiscal year.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; just to March 1.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the amount was to be expended on a monthly basis unless the Executive declared an emergency. As I understand, the only emergency presented to us in the President's message was the hurricane and the damages resulting therefrom in New England and along the Atlantic seaboard. My question is, Was the approximate amount recommended by the committee, the \$725,000,000, spent additionally because of that emergency?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There were a great many conditions that brought about the increased need for public expenditures in the fall of 1937. The gentleman is quite familiar with that situation, I am sure.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That was not alone due to the hurricane?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan; and then, Mr. Chairman, I am going to yield the floor.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, the resolution is not understandable except as it is read in connection and at the same time with the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938; in other words, the resolution as drafted cannot be understood unless one has the other law before him. I have sent for that law and have it before me. There is a question in my mind that I might be able to solve after study, but the gentleman undoubtedly knows the answer.

The gist of this resolution is the appropriation of \$725,000,000, and it "shall proportionately increase the amounts specified in limitations (1), (2), and (3) of (d) of subsection (1) of section 1 of such act."

None of the other subsections in section 1 being mentioned, is it the purpose of the resolution that none of this money shall be spent for purposes of administration?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The money is to be spent for exactly the same purposes as set out in the original bill in proportionate amounts.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; but, if that is true, why does not the resolution state that it is to be spent in proportionate amounts in accordance with the original bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is what it does state.

Mr. MICHENER. No; the resolution picks out three subsections, and the matter of administration is not in one of those subsections. Therefore, if the entire amount is prorated proportionately among (1), (2), and (3) of (d) of subsection (1), then none of this money will be used for the purposes of administration, as my casual observation tells me.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. When the gentleman observes it more carefully, he will see that the fund goes in accordance with the terms of the original bill, proportionately. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. FOLGER). The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, your committee has brought in here a resolution providing for the appropriation of \$725,000,000. This is a cut of \$150,000,000 below the Budget estimate for relief purposes which was secondly submitted. It is a cut, so that you may realize how small the cut really is, of \$25,000,000 below what was stated in the President's regular Budget estimate which was sent in here first on Thursday a week ago. That appears on page 21 of the Roman-numbered pages of the Budget.

Last spring we appropriated \$1,425,000,000 for W. P. A. and relief. It was the intention of the Congress, and it was stated to us by the Administrator of W. P. A., that it was the intention to run along slowly, increasing the number of those who were then on the rolls, 2,500,000, to a total of 3,100,000 when winter arrived. What happened was that on June 1 there were about 2,650,000 on the W. P. A. rolls, and at that time

the unemployment figures were at their peak, 13,000,000. The unemployment figures began to drop on June 1 and dropped in a steadily declining curve until at the present time, we are told, they are 11,000,000. We were told by the Administrator that he expected a further drop from eleven million to nine million and a half by the 1st day of July, when the appropriation which we are considering at the moment would expire.

The present enrollment of the W. P. A. is approximately 3,000,000. I do not have the exact figure in my head. On November 12, 1938, W. P. A. was at its peak. It ran up from 2,600,000 to 3,250,000 in the week of November 7.

In the State of Ohio, for instance, the increase was from 84,000 in September of 1937 to 284,000 on election day of 1938.

In the State of Pennsylvania the increase ran from approximately 148,000 in September 1937 to a figure of 239,000 on May 27, about the time of their primary, and to 290,000 on November 12. These are just illustrations.

I hold here in my hand the report of the committee investigating un-American activities and propaganda, and on pages 30 to 40 of that document you will find un-American activities of the W. P. A. demonstrated by testimony quoted in those pages and indicating that the United States Government is paying the salaries of people who are writing articles and guidebooks for sale by the W. P. A. subversive of the Government of the United States and designed to stir up class hatred. I am wondering how it happens that when such things as this are going on and we are building up our roll in the W. P. A. contrary to the trend of unemployment, contrary to the needs of the people, contrary to the trust that was placed in the executives in charge of the W. P. A., when perhaps half of those who were placed upon the roll were placed upon it not because of need for relief but because of other reasons.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COX. Of course, the gentleman knows it has been stated throughout the country for a long while that there is a very definite tie-up between the "reds" and the W. P. A.

Mr. TABER. I understand that is correct.

Mr. COX. Personally, I think the W. P. A. has functioned in a manner to give support to that charge. Of course, everybody in W. P. A. knows that such charges have been made. Did any of them come before the gentleman's committee from that organization and seek to answer that charge or in any wise to deny the charge?

Mr. TABER. No one discussed that question before our committee. The evidence we have with reference to it on the hearings in connection with this bill is entirely with reference to other matters, and the only things that we have available are hearings before other committees, and, especially, a certain other committee to which I have referred; but I do think I should like at this moment to read from the hearings on the first deficiency bill of 1936, to show that this set-up is not of recent origin but that it has been prevalent throughout:

Mr. TABER. Is it true that Katharine A. Kellock is a field superintendent of this outfit [referring to the guidebook proposition]?

Mr. HOPKINS. I am not sure about the exact nature of her work, but I think she is employed in that enterprise.

Mr. TABER. She is the wife of the publicity director of the Soviet Embassy?

Mr. HOPKINS. I think she is. She is an American citizen, a very competent newspaper person, with long experience, which qualifies her to do that work.

Now, she was in charge of the guidebook proposition which was to be distributed all over the United States.

Mr. COX. Is not supporting evidence to be found in the manner in which these public funds have been expended; in other words, in those areas of the country where the "red" influence is prevalent the greater part of the funds have been expended. For instance, in single States more of the W. P. A. money has been expended than in the 13 Southern States, where there is little, if any, "red" influence.

Mr. TABER. I think that the expenditures have largely been made in that territory. For instance, the employment in New York City was 180,000 on December 17. In up-State

New York, with a much greater proportionate population than this employment showed, it was 64,000.

Mr. COX. Did the gentleman's committee give consideration to the thought of writing into the law some provision that would make impossible a further expenditure in this manner?

Mr. TABER. The committee itself did not give consideration to those things. Frankly, I favor—and I expect that there will be offered on the floor of the House here as the bill is read for amendment—amendments which would limit and prevent such a violation of the trust the Congress would impose upon whoever shall administer this money.

Mr. COX. Did anything develop in the hearings of the committee that encouraged the committee to hope that there would be better administration of the W. P. A. from now on?

Mr. TABER. I do not think there was anything in the hearings before the committee that would encourage anything of that character. There is this situation, of course: We have had a change in administration. We have a representative of the Engineer Corps of the Army in charge of the operation, but they still have Aubrey Williams; they still have a set-up there which is representative not of the best type of forward-looking Americans but of the type that proposes to support something else.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. What is there wrong about the city of New York having a certain number and the State another certain number?

Mr. TABER. Oh, there is nothing wrong, except as it applies to the need of relief; except as it applies, as the evidence before some of these committees has developed, to the employment of persons who were put on the rolls for some other reason than because they needed or deserved relief. That is the only reason.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentleman from New York has mentioned the Federal theater project and the Federal writers' project. I am wondering if this resolution goes through whether the supervisors of those projects will be put under civil service.

Mr. TABER. If this resolution goes through in the form in which it is supported by the committee, it will prevent putting any of the W. P. A. administrators under civil service. The committee was unanimous in believing that it is absolutely wrong to give civil-service status to that kind of a gang and place them on the pay roll forever. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I have referred to just a few of the things that, to my mind, discredit and utterly destroy the W. P. A. as an effective force in handling the relief program.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield at this time. I must say a few things myself. I believe it is absolutely necessary that this Congress set up some kind of a program which will put whatever contribution for relief the Government makes in a position where it can be effective and useful for relief. I myself believe that a return to the States of the funds for expenditure with a requirement of a proper contribution on their part would be an effective way. I believe it can be done and can be done effectively. I believe it can be done and put off the W. P. A. rolls such people as I get called to my attention all of the time. I have in my hand a letter from a source that I know is sound, from a State other than my own, but which I have investigated since I received the letter, and that letter reads:

Today an estate came to my attention, the record of which will be available in probate court, where the deceased had accounts in three different banks approximating \$2,500, a mortgage on which there was \$190 due, and a house and lot which he rented for \$20 a month.

The man referred to in the letter was killed in an accident while illegally employed on the W. P. A., and there is going to be a claim against the Government for damages on account

of his death before the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes. That is just an illustration of the same thing that you and I know is going on in our own communities, of the way this thing has been administered, of the way it has been abused. I think the committee has done a good job in bringing here a cut of \$150,000,000 in the second Budget estimate that came to the House, although it is only \$25,000,000 in the Budget estimate that came first. Frankly I believe less money should be appropriated, but I think we should be on the way to something that will get us out of this program rather than keep us in it. What I am going to propose is that we appropriate enough money to carry this matter to the 7th day of April. I say the 7th of April because that is 2 months in addition to the figures that they now claim they have the money to get along with until the 7th of February, and that in the meantime Congress be directed to get busy and formulate a definite program that will get rid of this kind of set-up—the kind of set-up that has gone back on the purpose that the Congress expressed for taking care of the worthy and needy, that has made it an instrument of politics, that has played politics with the people's misery.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield. I yielded once to the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. As the gentleman knows, last summer business was at very low ebb. The fall elections came on and the people elected what we believe to be a conservative Congress. Then business started going up and has continued until the past 2 weeks, when the President came here and said, "Let us spend more money." Then he made four radical appointments. I mean, Frankfurter to the Supreme Court, Hopkins and Murphy, and Senator Pope to the T. V. A. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Does he think there is any chance of reducing W. P. A. rolls so long as they continue to spend more money and appoint radicals in important key positions?

Mr. TABER. The W. P. A. rolls can be reduced by getting rid of a large number that do not belong there. The cleaning up of those rolls, in my opinion, will reduce them 500,000 alone. In addition to that, at the present time the State relief rolls are only a million and a half, a rather comparatively low figure. In addition to that, the figures indicate that there has been an enormous spread of something like a half million in the last year and a half, of those who are drawing benefits out of the so-called Social Security Act. I do not believe, with the present trend, that there is any question but what we can legitimately and properly reduce the W. P. A. load. I believe if we would remove the restrictions against business recovery, which the Corcoran and Cohen group have persuaded the President to place upon business, the appointments to the National Labor Relations Board and to other key positions in the Government, we would encourage business to go ahead and employ people, and there would be no trouble in wiping out the W. P. A. entirely. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Now, in my opinion, if the Congress should adopt a program which would carry the W. P. A. on until the 7th day of April, and practically demand that a definite program be set up for the handling of that relief question, that is the only way it can be done, because, except under pressure, you cannot move a mountain of that size. Except under pressure you cannot force anything of that kind through. I believe that when that amendment is offered, if this Committee will adopt it, we will have started on the way toward solving this relief problem in an intelligent and satisfactory way to the American people.

I hope this Committee will support the amendments. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WARREN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 83, directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hess, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my annual message to this Congress I have spoken at some length of the changing world conditions outside of the American hemisphere which make it imperative that we take immediate steps for the protection of our liberties.

It would be unwise for any of us to yield to any form of hysteria. Nevertheless, regardless of political affiliations, we can properly join in an appraisal of the world situation and agree on the immediate defense needs of the Nation.

It is equally sensational and untrue to take the position that we must at once spend billions of additional money for building up our land, sea, and air forces, on the one hand, or to insist that no further additions are necessary on the other.

What needs to be emphasized is the great change which has come over conflicts between nations since the World War ended, and especially during the past 5 or 6 years.

Those of us who took part in the conduct of the World War will remember that in the preparation of the American armies for actual participation in battle, the United States, entering the war on April 6, 1917, took no part whatsoever in any major engagement until the end of May 1918. In other words, while other armies were conducting the actual fighting, the United States had more than a year of absolute peace at home without any threat of attack on this continent, to train men, to produce raw materials, to process them into munitions and supplies, and to forge the whole into fighting forces. It is even a matter of record that as late as the autumn of 1918, American armies at the front used almost exclusively French or British artillery and aircraft.

Calling attention to these facts does not remotely intimate that the Congress or the President have any thought of taking part in another war on European soil, but it does show that in 1917 we were not ready to conduct large-scale land or air operations. Relatively, we are not much more ready to do so today than we were then—and we cannot guarantee a long period, free from attack, in which we could prepare.

I have called attention to the fact that "we must have armed forces and defenses strong enough to ward off sudden attack against strategic positions and key facilities essential to insure sustained resistance and ultimate victory." And I have said, "We must have the organization and location of those key facilities so that they may be immediately utilized and rapidly expanded to meet all needs without danger of serious interruption by enemy attack."

I repeat that "there is new range and speed to offense."

Therefore, it has become necessary for every American to restudy present defense against the possibilities of present offense against us.

Careful examination of the most imperative present needs leads me to recommend the appropriation at this session of the Congress, with as great speed as possible, of approximately \$525,000,000, of which sum approximately \$210,000,000 would be actually spent from the Treasury before the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

The survey indicates that of this sum approximately \$450,000,000 should be allocated for new needs of the Army,

\$65,000,000 for new needs of the Navy, and \$10,000,000 for training of civilian air pilots.

The several items will be submitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress by the departments concerned, and I need, therefore, touch only on the major divisions of the total.

In the case of the Army, information from other nations leads us to believe that there must be a complete revision of our estimates for aircraft. The Baker board report of a few years ago is completely out of date. No responsible officer advocates building our air forces up to the total either of planes on hand or of productive capacity equal to the forces of certain other nations. We are thinking in the terms of necessary defenses and the conclusion is inevitable that our existing forces are so utterly inadequate that they must be immediately strengthened.

It is proposed that \$300,000,000 be appropriated for the purchase of several types of airplanes for the Army. This should provide a minimum increase of 3,000 planes, but it is hoped that orders placed on such a large scale will materially reduce the unit cost and actually provide many more planes.

Military aviation is increasing today at an unprecedented and alarming rate. Increased range, increased speed, increased capacity of airplanes abroad have changed our requirements for defensive aviation. The additional planes recommended will considerably strengthen the air defenses of the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone. If an appropriation bill can be quickly enacted, I suggest that \$50,000,000 of the \$300,000,000 for airplanes be made immediately available in order to correct the present lag in aircraft production due to idle plants.

Of the balance of approximately \$150,000,000 requested for the Army, I suggest an appropriation of \$110,000,000 to provide "critical items" of equipment which would be needed immediately in time of emergency, and which cannot be obtained from any source within the time and quantity desired—materiel such as antiaircraft artillery, semiautomatic rifles, antitank guns, tanks, light and heavy artillery, ammunition, and gas masks. Such purchases would go far to equip existing units of the regular Army and the National Guard.

I suggest approximately \$32,000,000 for "educational orders" for the Army—in other words, to enable industry to prepare for quantity production in an emergency, of those military items which are noncommercial in character and are so difficult of manufacture as to constitute what is known as "bottle necks" in the problem of procurement.

The balance should be used, I believe, for improving and strengthening the seacoast defenses of Panama, Hawaii, and the continental United States, including the construction of a highway outside the limits of the Panama Canal Zone, important to the defense of the Zone.

The estimated appropriation of \$65,000,000 for the Navy should be divided into (a) \$44,000,000 for the creation or strengthening of Navy bases in both oceans in general agreement with the report of the special board which has already been submitted to the Congress, (b) about \$21,000,000 for additional Navy airplanes and air-material tests.

Finally national defense calls for the annual training of additional air pilots. This training should be primarily directed to the essential qualifications for civilian flying. In cooperation with educational institutions it is believed that the expenditure of \$10,000,000 a year will give primary training to approximately 20,000 citizens.

In the above recommendations for appropriations, totaling \$525,000,000, I have omitted reference to a definite need, which, however, relates to the implementing of existing defenses for the Panama Canal. The security of the Canal is of the utmost importance. The peace garrison now there is inadequate to defend this vital link. This deficiency cannot be corrected with existing forces without seriously jeopardizing the general defense by stripping the continental United States of harbor defense and antiaircraft personnel. The

permanent garrison in the Canal Zone should be increased to provide the minimum personnel required to man the anti-aircraft and seacoast armament provided for the defense of the Canal. Such personnel cannot be increased until additional housing facilities are provided; and in the meantime additional personnel must be trained. I recommend, therefore, an appropriation of \$27,000,000 to provide an adequate peace garrison for the Canal Zone and to house it adequately. Five million dollars of this sum should be made available immediately in order that work on necessary construction can be initiated.

All of the above constitutes a well-rounded program, considered by me, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and by my advisers, to be a minimum program for the necessities of defense. Every American is aware of the peaceful intentions of the Government and of the people. Every American knows that we have no thought of aggression; no desire for further territory.

Nevertheless, as the Executive head of the Government, I am compelled to look facts in the face. We have a splendid asset in the quality of our manhood. But without modern weapons and without adequate training the men, however splendid the type, would be hopelessly handicapped if we were attacked.

The young men of this Nation should not be compelled to take the field with antiquated weapons. It would be economically unsound to provide in time of peace for all the modern equipment needed in a war emergency. But it would be nationally unsound not to provide the critical items of equipment which might be needed for immediate use, and not to provide for facilities for mass production in the event of war.

Devoid of all hysteria, this program is but the minimum of requirements.

I trust, therefore, that the Congress will quickly act on this emergency program for the strengthening of the defense of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 12, 1939.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by including two resolutions adopted by the Committee on Appropriations concerning the death of our late colleagues, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Boylan, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. Bacon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 83, making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 83, with Mr. WARREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on the eve of America's entry into the World War, insuring victory for the Allies, a panic seized a large part of the French people and three entire army corps left the front-line trenches and retreated on Paris. Today in America's war against the depression, with victory already in sight, there are those who would sound a retreat. Already within reach of the goal our comrades falter. They are unwilling to go the last mile. They are unwilling to keep men moving up into the front-line jobs. There is general agreement that the campaign for employment is succeeding. All authorities report a general upturn in business on every front. But just at this critical

period the committee brings in a proposal to dismiss from employment more than a million workmen today earning their daily bread in productive employment.

In order to see the situation a little more clearly, let us clear away some of the underbrush about this proposition. The resolution contains a number of minor provisions.

There is practically no difference of opinion on either side of the aisle on any of these items. I think there is general concurrence on the part of the committee and the House on both sides of the aisle in the entire resolution with the one exception of the amount of the appropriation. The appropriation of \$875,000,000 recommended by the Budget will keep 3,081,300 men at work. The appropriation of \$725,000,000 recommended by the committee will employ only 1,930,000. In other words, the committee proposes to throw out of employment, in the dead of winter, 1,151,300 men.

So, Mr. Chairman, the whole question before the House this afternoon is the hiring or firing of these 1,151,300 men. That is the sole issue presented by this resolution. But it is a more important question than may appear at first blush. These 1,151,300 men are breadwinners. They are heads of families. When you deprive them of work you deprive their dependent families of support.

The P. W. A. estimates each family to average $3\frac{1}{2}$ persons. That is a conservative estimate, as the traditional military ratio is five to a family. But even at the minimum estimate, the number of dependents affected by this reduction would aggregate 4,026,550 persons. At the Army ratio it will affect 5,726,500 people. But it goes further than that. The business created and supported by the needs of this vast number of people, their trade with merchants, artisans, and professional men, gives employment to numerous other workers who, without this business, will also be thrown out of employment. So, on a conservative estimate, the proposition of the committee here is to take away the subsistence of from six to eight million people. It is not necessary to draw on the imagination to understand what that would mean to the people themselves or to the business interests of the country.

The committee gives no tenable reason for its ruthless recommendation except a desire to save money. In fact there is no reason. Every witness called by the committee demonstrated the need for increased rather than decreased employment. Every item of evidence submitted to the committee supported the President's recommendation of \$875,000,000. You can read the hearings through from the first page to the last and there is not one line or a single statement that justifies a decrease of a dollar in the appropriation or the reduction of a job in the employment program. The proposal to reduce the amount is so unwarranted, so at variance with the evidence, so unjustified by the statistics submitted in the hearings, that it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the committee met with the preconceived determination to cut the amount recommended by the Budget. No matter what amount had been recommended, the committee would have cut it. If the request had been for \$500,000,000 the committee would have cut it. If the estimate had been for \$200,000,000 they would have cut it. Apparently it is a purely arbitrary cut unsupported by any fact or formula. And certainly it is not supported by the American people.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My time is very limited. I hope the gentleman will excuse me.

We have had the recommendation of the committee. Now, let us examine the recommendation of the country at large.

Let us take up the recommendation of organized agriculture on this subject. Let us consult the wishes of organized labor on this proposed reduction. Let us consider the recommendation of the organized veterans of the United States, the opinion of the clergy, of recognized economists, businessmen, and the Conference of Mayors of the United States. With astonishing unanimity each of these great groups, in direct and intimate touch with business, labor, and relief in every section of the country, is asking a continuation of the W. P. A. program and a continuation or increase in W. P. A. activity.

The American Farm Bureau Federation in its annual meeting at New Orleans, which adjourned just a week or two ago, adopted this resolution:

To the President of the United States and the Members of the Seventy-sixth Congress:

Pursuant to resolutions adopted by the House of voting delegates at the twentieth annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation herewith calls to the attention of the President of the United States and the Members of the Seventy-sixth Congress the following matters, which are considered by the organization to be of outstanding importance to the Nation:

We recommend: * * *

(b) That the Federal Government continue to provide employment for those who cannot secure employment in private industry.

We are convinced that the Federal Government must continue to supply the bulk of relief funds, for the burden is beyond the present capacity of the local political divisions to handle; and we recognize the continued necessity that the Government provide capital investment funds until such time as private funds are again attracted into productive enterprise.

There is the statement of a great national agricultural organization speaking for the farmers of the country. Organized labor takes the same view.

Out of a number of official statements I will read one or two representative declarations:

Any reduction in the proposed allotment of funds for W. P. A. would seriously handicap the functioning of W. P. A. and would probably mean an even greater number of dismissals of both project and administrative employees.

W. P. A. has provided relief to the people of our industry as well as to millions in other industries during a period of extreme want and necessity. We urge an appropriation for at least \$1,000,000,000.

And I must take time to read just one more which I am certain will be of particular interest to the Members of the House. The several Congressmen who have expressed themselves on this question here this afternoon do not have a single child in school. But here is an opinion from the organized teachers of the Nation speaking from first-hand knowledge on this subject of such vital concern to the children under their care:

JANUARY 11, 1938.

PA 218 21 NL

CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.:

American Federation of Teachers, numbering 30,000 affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, urges full appropriation for W. P. A. as recommended by the President.

Mr. Chairman, this is the recommendation of the teachers of the land who come in daily contact with the child problem, who know family conditions, who see children coming to school sometimes without breakfast, and sometimes without shoes. They know that if this reduction is made there will be a good many more without breakfast and without needed clothing and medical care.

The churchmen of the Nation, whose relation to the problem is even more intimate than that of the teachers, have exhibited even a greater interest.

Upon the desk of every Member of Congress are letters from the clergy of the Nation, including practically every denomination and creed. No one is in a position to speak with more knowledge and more authority on this question affecting both the material and the spiritual welfare of the people and the Nation. And they uniformly endorse an increase rather than a reduction of the amount provided in this bill. In this connection I must also include in the RECORD the opinion of the accredited economists of the Nation, as follows:

DEAR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT: We, the undersigned economists, are addressing ourselves to you in order to express our opinions on a national problem of greatest importance which falls within our sphere of professional competence.

Newspaper reports, which have not been denied, indicate that the Works Progress Administration is planning to cut its rolls by a third during the next 2 or 3 months. This action, we understand, is contemplated in order to stretch the present relief appropriation and to lay the ground for a greatly reduced deficiency appropriation next spring. Such a policy would involve throwing some million breadwinners and their families into destitution during the severe winter months. It would involve a reduction of more than \$50,000,000 per month in direct wage payments in addition to some \$30,000,000 in related expenditures. Such a cut in consumer purchasing power would, we believe,

constitute a severe threat to the continuance of the present economic recovery, and might even cause a serious set-back in business activity.

The rapid upsurge in business during the last 6 months has been a source of encouragement to those who believe that the severity of swings in business activity need not be accepted fatalistically but can be successfully counteracted by wise social action. Thanks to the vigorous action taken last spring by the Federal Government under your leadership, the recession of 1937 was arrested; and the curve of business and employment turned upward. The expansion of the spending program was the chief governmental weapon used in fighting the recession and stimulating the recovery. Furthermore during these 6 months the major channel for the disbursement of new purchasing power has been the Works Progress Administration, and we believe that the Works Progress Administration should continue to perform this function until private industry clearly demonstrates its capacity to absorb all those released from relief rolls.

We conclude, Mr. President, that the curtailment of the Works Progress Administration at the present time would be particularly ill-timed from an economic as well as from a humanitarian viewpoint, and we strongly urge that the contemplated policy of curtailment be abandoned.

Of the 69 signers of the statement, 13 are members of the faculty of Harvard, 7 are from Yale, 7 from Columbia, 6 from Northwestern, 6 from Brooklyn College, 5 from Mount Holyoke, and 4 from Tufts. Among the other institutions represented are Brown, Williams, Amherst, Stanford, University of Wisconsin, University of Illinois, University of Chicago, Cornell, New York University, University of Minnesota, and Princeton.

On the other hand, there is not an economist from any college or university in the United States who has endorsed this unwarranted, unscientific, and arbitrary reduction in the amount recommended by the President.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. Did the gentleman have some evidence before his committee that all of those persons certified as being eligible for W. P. A. were not on the W. P. A. at the present time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman calls attention to the fact that even with the present employment there are still over 500,000 who have been certified to W. P. A. but for whom W. P. A. is unable to provide work of any kind. They are eligible, they have been on the waiting list for months, but even with the current appropriation they cannot be provided for. And in addition, there are twice as many eligible awaiting certification.

The statement was made on the floor here a few minutes ago that P. W. A. would provide a million and a half jobs. Of course, the P. W. A. program was taken into consideration when these figures were tabulated. Furthermore, it should not be overlooked that we made these estimates on the assumption that the present acceleration in business and industry would continue. If such a reduction as is here proposed, or any other untoward condition, interferes with recovery, it will require more than a billion dollars to carry the program through to June 30 instead of \$875,000,000.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I wish I could yield to the gentleman, but I have only a minute or two remaining.

Mr. Chairman, the businessmen of the country are also opposed to this reduction. Out of the \$875,000,000 recommended in the Budget, \$750,000,000 is paid out in wages which flow directly into the channels of trade. If you withdraw from the retail business of the country that enormous amount, it affects the retail merchant, it affects the jobber, the wholesaler, the factory—it shakes the entire fabric of American commerce and business. Take a plebiscite of your home-town merchants and get their recommendation on the wisdom of the Nation's investment in W. P. A.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is no one more entitled to pass on this question or better qualified to understand it than the ex-service men and their organizations. Here is a communication which speaks for itself:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,

January 11, 1939.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANNON: I am enclosing a copy of the detailed objectives of the V. F. W. and call your particular attention to the points checked with red pencil.

MILLARD W. RICE,
Legislative Representative.

Point 3:

7. Retention of W. P. A. with liberalized eligibility for entry, reentry, and retention of veterans who need such employment.

The organized veterans of the Nation not only endorse the present provisions for W. P. A. but they favor their liberalization.

But, Mr. Chairman, the most significant recommendations on this entire question come from the mayors of the United States, representing every city in the United States of over 50,000 population. They express the opinion that disaster will follow any reduction in this appropriation. And who is better qualified to pass on the questions involved in W. P. A.? Is it not rather singular that there is not a single chief executive in any city in any State in the Union who believes that this appropriation ought to be reduced?

Mr. Chairman, if the proposed reduction had any merit, if it was based on any material grounds, if it is justified from any reasonable point of view, surely they could find at least one mayor in the entire United States who would support their contention. Organized agriculture, organized labor, organized veterans, organized business and businessmen, churchmen, economists, the mayors of every large city in the land are of one accord in support of the full amount asked by the Budget. But the Congressman, in his superior wisdom, comes in, and he sees that the child has on its plate both bread and potatoes. "Oh," he says, "you have too much," and the Congressman, by his vote on this resolution, reaches over and takes the potatoes off the plate. It is hard on the child, perhaps, but it helps balance the Budget. Now, that is not melodrama. It is the inevitable result in homes all over the Nation of an affirmative vote on the pending resolution.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am sorry.

And in their argument on balancing the Budget they go back and quote a message of the President of the United States, delivered when the public debt was \$21,000,000,000, the most specious argument made in this debate. Why not go back to 1916, when the debt was \$1,000,000,000? It would have been just as consistent.

Mr. Chairman, between the time when the debt was \$1,000,000,000 in 1916 and the time when the debt was \$21,000,000,000, this country went through a trying ordeal, and the gentleman does not question that debt. Since the time the President of the United States wrote that message the country has gone through another great trial, a depression that brought disaster to more people than the war, and no one will say that the money was not well spent if it saved the American people.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] is to be commended for the clear and logical presentation of the question before us at this time. He enjoys the confidence and the respect of those who have served with him in the House. His position on the present measure deserves the confidence and respect of the country. I admire, as I believe a majority of you admire the courage and conviction he displayed today.

On the 8th of last November a mandate was delivered by the American people. It is encouraging to note the responsiveness of many of the men here to that mandate. By their ballots on November 8, the American people declared that there should be an end to the profligacy, to the extravagance, to the corrupt administration of public affairs, particularly in the administration of relief to the needy. The American people, by their ballots, demanded a reformation of public administration—such a reformation as would recognize honesty and integrity as worth-while virtues upon which we could depend and in which we could take a justifiable

pride. The Republican gains in the House came as a result of the demand of the American people for the establishment of a sensible and reasonable administration of national affairs. And every Republican is aware of and alert to that challenge.

The gentleman from Missouri has attempted to say that relief has been free of politics. I call his attention to the fact that the former W. P. A. Administrator, Mr. Hopkins, who has been appointed Secretary of Commerce, appeared before a committee of the Senate yesterday. During the course of his remarks before that committee, he expressed regret for the part which he played as the Administrator of this relief agency in the political affairs of the Nation. There was contrition. There was regret. There was confession. It seems to me that was an acknowledgment that politics had come into the W. P. A., and that the heartaches and the distress of men had been toyed with for political purposes. I am surprised that my friend from Missouri has not sensed the contrition and regret, which I interpreted as genuine, on the part of the former Administrator.

In all the history of this Nation, there has been nothing done by any administration so calculated to destroy public confidence in the integrity of representative government as the vast, and, as yet largely unrevealed, prostitution of public relief funds for political ends by scheming self-seekers intent upon maintaining themselves in power.

Never in all the history of this Nation has there been such a spectacle of human misfortune, want, and misery being made the pawns of political machinations as has been witnessed under the administration of relief funds in the last 4 years.

This political misuse of relief funds shows a cynicism appalling in its utter abandonment of all political decency. It represents corruption of a character too mean and contemptible adequately to be expressed in words. If words could express it, it would be found in the phrase, "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect."

From every State in this Union have come reports of these misuses of relief funds, and it is worse than idle to attempt to gloss over or to hide either the nefarious practices engaged in by unscrupulous politicians or the inexpressibly terrible effects of these practices upon the conscience of the Nation and upon the morale of the unemployed.

In my own State of Pennsylvania—and conditions there were typical of conditions in other States—the extent of the padding of work-relief pay rolls before the elections to gain votes for the New Deal ticket is being demonstrated day by day as the great purge of the W. P. A. rolls proceeds in the Keystone State. It was stated a few days ago in an editorial that the total number to be thrown off work relief within 2 months after the elections is 45,500, and the end is not yet.

The unfortunate unemployed, who have been shocked, disillusioned, and embittered by this action, began to learn their fate on the very day following the elections. The families of those thousands who were handed preelection jobs and extravagant promises by the New Deal politicians are now being callously shoved out into the cold, with their source of income shut off and no employment in sight.

The New Deal politicians needed votes; apparently they believed that a good method of obtaining them was by the wholesale temporary padding of the W. P. A. rolls just before the elections. The unfortunate unemployed represented to these New Deal politicians just so many potential votes. Their usefulness as voters expired when the elections were over. Whether the New Deal ticket won or lost, these unfortunate and helpless people were slated for prompt dismissal. The New Deal politicians knew that, of course, but they cruelly permitted those put on relief to regard their pitiful W. P. A. employment as something more than a temporary rescue from their condition of suffering.

Only a certain amount of money was available for W. P. A. use. The New Deal leaders wanted to put their hands on as much of this money as possible during the campaign instead of spreading it out evenly in the months preceding the next session of the Congress. In this uneconomic

but politically expedient scheme these New Deal politicians in my State were given every aid by those in charge of the W. P. A. at Washington. Not only in Pennsylvania but in other States where the beleaguered candidates appealed for Federal ammunition in the form of relief funds, the W. P. A. administrators obliged by loading the rolls, knowing full well that they were making them so top-heavy that post-election cuts would be inevitable.

This W. P. A. money, obtained from taxes wrung from the pockets of all the people and from borrowings which must be repaid by the people, simply became a campaign fund to bolster the New Deal cause in the various States. The misuse of these funds fortunately did not succeed in preventing a return to a better balanced biparty government in this country; but who can measure the human agony, the bitter disappointment, the incalculable damage to the moral fiber of the hundreds of thousands of citizens and their millions of dependents by this supercynical and inexpressibly corrupt use of public relief funds for political purposes? Who, I say, Mr. Chairman, can measure the damage that has been wrought upon the lives of these people, upon their respect for the integrity of their Government, upon the confidence of the taxpayers in the governmental structure itself, by these nefarious and corrupt practices?

What an incredibly scandalous situation, Mr. Chairman. Here these relief funds, voted by the Congress for the express purpose of alleviating in some measure the distress of worthy unemployed citizens, were squandered by the millions in an effort to buy the elections. And now this Congress is faced, if you please, with the cold and ruthless threat that unless we appropriate \$875,000,000 the W. P. A. activities will be closed down; the unemployed will be abandoned to their misery; men, women, and children will be permitted to starve; and the grave unrest which constitutes a momentous threat to the very existence of this Nation will be precipitated upon us because of this callous, corrupt, and contemptible misuse of relief funds for political purposes.

It is all well and good, Mr. Chairman, that after his interference in the political affairs of the different States the W. P. A. Administrator, Harry Hopkins, should be promoted to the Cabinet post of Secretary in the Department of Commerce, where his large experience in private business before he came to Government service so eminently fits him to administer the affairs of that Department. And, of course, this promotion to the Cabinet was not by any chance intended to take Mr. Hopkins out of the line of fire in the future investigations of the W. P. A.

It is all well and good, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Aubrey Williams is taken out of W. P. A. and put over into the National Youth Administration, where his long and distinguished military experience and his outstanding tactical abilities can be utilized in the training of 20,000 youthful aviators in the schools and colleges every year. Again I would be the last to suggest that the purpose of this promotion—if such it can be called—was to remove Mr. Williams from the line of fire.

Regardless of the contempt demonstrated by high officials of the Government for the intelligence of the electorate, it still remains a fact that this relief problem is one of the fundamental difficulties facing this Nation. Bound up in it is the very welfare of our country itself. Involved in this question of relief is the future and the safety of our constitutional Republic. Prevention of suffering, starvation, agony, and death is the first call upon every human conscience, in Government and out.

If corruption, political manipulations, favoritism, and partisanship are permitted to continue in relief, the results will be an undermining of free government and an abridgment of personal liberties that can eventuate only in the collapse of our constitutional Government as we know it. It would open the way for the most rapid inroads by communism, on the one hand, or fascism on the other.

No more fertile field for the planting of these alien philosophies could possibly be found than in the ranks of those

who, through no fault of their own, are unable to find private employment, and who have been thus cynically made the temporary and helpless pawns of bureaucrats motivated by lust for political power. It is impossible, Mr. Chairman, to conceive of any condition that could be more dangerous to the perpetuity of free government and to the peace and welfare of this Nation than that which has been produced by the cruel and wanton betrayal of these unemployed citizens. When great numbers of the people are forced to abandon their respect for government, their belief in its integrity, and their faith in the humanity of their fellow men, they immediately become prey to the persuasions of the most desperate enemies of constitutional government.

Can they be blamed? Where are they to turn? Where are they to fix their faith, when they are compelled to the conclusion that their Government is false to its trust, that their misfortunes and their privations represent to those in power merely a means of subjecting them to a political servitude? Such conditions would well-nigh shatter the faith of a saint.

This question of relief must be approached wholly from the standpoint of maintaining our unemployed citizens and their dependents in decency and self-respect as a temporary measure until we can bring about those conditions under which they can find work by which to support themselves through their own efforts. Any other approach to this question is utterly unworthy of us as Members of Congress; it is unworthy of any administration; it is unworthy of the American people themselves, and it will not be tolerated.

There is no single problem facing this Nation today fraught with greater danger, if it is improperly handled, than the relief problem. We must give our best and most unselfish thought and effort to placing the administration of relief beyond the clutches of those who are contemptible enough, unpatriotic enough, dishonest enough, to pervert the purposes of relief to personal political ends. We must make a basic reexamination of the whole problem of relief. We must keep in mind that these Federal funds do not belong to any Federal official or any group of officials. They are the property of the whole country, and they should be distributed with most scrupulous care to make certain that the geographical distribution is as equitable, considering varying local conditions, as it can possibly be made.

I have a few figures which I believe will prove significant. I wonder why it is that in the election year 1934 relief expenditures were increased 20.4 percent, while in the nonelection year 1935 relief expenditures were decreased 27.9 percent. In the election year 1936—mark you, business was going then—relief expenditures were increased 44.3 percent, and in the nonelection year 1937 they were decreased 24.9 percent. Is that just a coincidence, or does it mark a very distinct effort upon the part of those charged with the relief of human need to use the agencies and the funds for political purposes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I am not yielding. I call attention now to a few States where some rather significant figures can be found—increases, for instance, during the last election period. These increases were notable in several States, and I call attention to a few of them. The five first States in the order of actual increases in W. P. A. relief workers were the following: Ohio, 176,899; Michigan, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and then comes the State of my distinguished colleague, for whom I express my deep regard and affection, the State of Missouri. There we have an increase of 60,900. Of course, that may have no significance whatever to my friend. To some of us it means much.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Ohio has been more or less chagrined at the fact that our State marks the greatest increase of any State in the Union in the period between January and November. There is no reason in the world

why Ohio should be in that position, because it is a big agricultural State as well as a manufacturing State, and the only reason that can be given is that at that time we had a fierce contest for United States Senator and for Governor, and, in spite of all this increase and all of the money, Ohio went overwhelmingly Republican.

Mr. DITTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. May I say to the distinguished gentleman, of course he understands that I cast no aspersions on the State of Ohio.

Unfortunately, Ohio was selected because of the heavy fight that was going on in that State.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I rejoin by saying there is no economic reason why Ohio should be in the forefront in this controversy.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. DITTER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I saw a statement published awhile ago showing the increase in W. P. A. activities in various parts of the country, and I was very much struck with the fact that the increases were very small in the solid South. That was no doubt on the theory that there was no use in giving bait to fish that were already in the boat. [Laughter.]

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman would care to have them, I would like to give a few figures on the situation in the South.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would be delighted to hear them.

Mr. DITTER. For instance, it is interesting to note how much money per capita went to certain of the cities. It is generally recognized that the need is greater in the industrial centers, although I am inclined to think that in a great many instances the agricultural sections are in just as great need. Nevertheless, the cities are taken as the standard—as an index.

Look at the figures compiled by the community chests and civic organizations of the per capita distribution of Federal funds among certain cities. These funds include W. P. A., Civilian Conservation Corps, and National Youth Administration. They represent the annual funds on the basis of total population allotted by the three Federal agencies in each of these cities in the calendar year 1936, an election year:

Greensboro, N. C., received the paltry sum of \$6.74. The solid South. Greenville, S. C., \$7.95. Still in the solid South. Galveston, \$8.80. Still down South. Then I could give you Richmond and a few more. Let us jump to the cities in the North. Let us jump to those places where contests were had. Let us jump to those places where the Republicans could give battle. Indianapolis, \$22.09. Minneapolis, \$23.65. Kansas City, \$24.98. St. Paul, \$30.97.

Mr. KNUTSON. Evidently the expenditures were based upon the necessity for extensive campaigns.

Mr. DITTER. It will be noted that the cities in the safely solid Democratic South received the least funds, while the cities in the North, particularly in questionable political territory, received the greatest allotments. There may be some rhyme or reason in these allocations. There may be some simple explanation of why some cities of political significance in the North got nearly five times as much as some of the cities in the South, but it would take a New Dealer to adduce either rhyme or reason for this condition of affairs.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I only have a very limited time at my command.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield on the Philadelphia situation?

Mr. DITTER. I have been very generous, I think, in the way I have yielded. I must go on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield further.

Mr. DITTER. The immorality of this thing is a matter that is acknowledged by most everybody. I can hardly imagine anyone who, having read the Sheppard report, would be bold enough to try to defend these policies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DITTER. So that in spite of what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] may have said as to the innocence, the sublime innocence, of the W. P. A., we still contend that the evidence is irrefutable that relief and politics have been mixed together, and that political purposes were the dominant purposes of those in charge of relief. But I want to think about the inefficiency of the Administration. The gentleman from Missouri asks why the figure which he advocates has been reduced.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I cannot yield at this time.

I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Colonel Harrington, who appeared before the committee, admitted that there had been no case study made of any of these W. P. A. beneficiaries in years. The newspapers of Philadelphia carried an article a few days ago that Pennsylvania administrators admitted that in the last 3 years no case study had been made of any of those on relief—on the W. P. A. rolls. The status may have changed, but they continue on W. P. A.

Now, if the gentleman from Missouri is advocating a W. P. A. career life, if that is his purpose, then let us know it. If he means to take W. P. A. people and fashion them into career services, then that should be the plea of the gentleman as he comes here seeking increased appropriations. If, on the other hand, he stands by the President—and I stand by the President now—if he stands by the President when the President declared that he intended to balance the Budget, as he brought us his message on January 5, then I feel that the gentleman from Missouri should join with those who are trying to help the President carry out his professed program.

We—and I speak now for my own Republican group—we claim today that neither the Democratic Party nor the President of the United States has a monopoly on either sympathy or concern for the needy and the distressed. We claim we are just as mindful of the need of the American people as either the Democratic group, who is trying to increase this appropriation, or the professions that have been made by the President from time to time. We know that we are dealing with human needs. We are just as conscious of the human needs as is the President. We are also mindful, however, that those human needs must be met with practical means, means within the limitations which are ours. We claim that a practical sympathy coupled with a practical ministry will be most effective.

The ranks on this side of the aisle have been augmented. We have made pledges to the American people. God willing, we intend to live up to those pledges. We have promised that adequate relief for the needy would be continued. We stand by that promise as we declare: Millions for relief, but not one cent for political tribute. The Republican Party stands today where it has always stood, that the first obligation of the administration is a recovery program, a program providing for the restoration of jobs in private industry. We stand by that declaration. And we pledge today to the American people what every man on this side of the aisle pledged during the campaign—every man who was reelected or who unseated a Democrat—that sane, sensible, honest standards of government will be our constant purpose. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, the only excuse offered by this administration for this unparalleled policy of continued spending is that it promotes prosperity, revives business, and provides more jobs. The facts and the record will not bear out this contention. If the orgy of spending we have witnessed during the past 6 years would push up the national income, promote prosperity, and end unemployment, then every single American citizen today should have a job, should

be truly and really enjoying the abundant life, and there should be no national debt, because the indisputable fact is, the undeniable truth is, that more money has been spent by the New Deal since March 4, 1933, than was spent by all our administrations, all the Congresses and Presidents of the United States during the first 143 years of our history from George Washington to Woodrow Wilson, or from the adoption of the Constitution down to the outbreak of the World War.

Men come on this floor and in the guise of philanthropy and under the plea of humanitarianism propose to help the American people by spending their own money, borrowed money which they do not have, by mortgaging not only their own future but that of their children and their children's children. Oh, I was amazed to hear my good friend, my distinguished and able colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], say that there has been no politics in W. P. A. My God, Clarence, where have you been in the past 6 years? [Laughter and applause.]

During the first part of last October, Harry Hopkins, who has never done anything but get rid of other people's money, stopped in St. Louis—and how ingenious and resourceful he is in devising new ways and methods of disposing of it. Great liberals! These new dealers are liberal with the other guy's dough [applause], but even an Ozark hillbilly where I reside has enough hard common sense to know that Santa Claus really does not come down the chimney the night before Christmas, that all the Easter eggs are not laid by bunny rabbits, that no government can ever give to its people anything it does not take from them, and that eventually they must foot the bill. He who dances must pay the fiddler. As sure as night follows day, your chickens are coming home to roost. A lot of them came home on the 8th of last November. Now we have more chickens than we have roosts. [Laughter.]

Mr. Hopkins, stopping in St. Louis on his way to Fayetteville to receive an honorary doctor of laws degree from the University of Arkansas, a State where he had been Santa Claus so long, was interviewed by the press writers in St. Louis and was asked what he thought of DEWEY SHORT. This was just about a month before the last election. He answered with tongue in cheek and a faint smile—as reported by the press—"DEWEY SHORT, who is he? Never heard of him."

They said: "Why, he is the only Republican Member of Congress from Missouri."

"Well," said Hopkins with a broader smile, "he won't be after November 8."

Within 5 days after Mr. Hopkins made that statement out in St. Louis the number of men on W. P. A. pay rolls in Jasper County, the largest county in my district, more than doubled, was increased from approximately 1,800 to 4,600. While Mr. Hopkins may never have heard of DEWEY SHORT, he heard from a lot of hillbillies on November 8, because I was elected by more than double my former majority [applause], receiving Democratic as well as Republican votes and carrying 14 of the 15 counties in my district.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. In just a minute, Jerry. I want you to get this.

I just received a letter without any solicitation on my part, dated Diamond, Mo., January 5, 1939:

DIAMOND, Mo., January 5, 1939.

DEWEY: As regards the investigation of relief and politics, I wish to mention that the relief truck which came regularly from Neosho to Diamond and other places in the county did, prior to election, have only Democrat candidates' cards tacked on the relief truck, but no Republican cards. Now these cards were the size you might see tacked on any building or telephone pole—I am merely telling you this that you get the size; at any rate they were large enough that you did not need field glasses to read them at 20 feet. I don't know whether this will do you any good, but it is something that ought to be aired and it is a fact, too.

FRANK H. SHIMP.

P. S.—These cards were as large as this sheet of paper and not ones handed out on election day.—F. H. S.

I have here signed affidavits of individuals of Oregon and Howell Counties, Mo.

I, Alfred Andrews, being duly sworn upon my oath, say that I am a Democrat and that until recently I was a W. P. A. worker in Oregon County on a road project and that Clarence Moore was the foreman.

Parenthetically I may say that Oregon County is an overwhelming Democratic County.

Affiant states that shortly before the primary election, 1938, that Clarence Moore informed this affiant that it was necessary for him to vote for Ray Huddleston for candidate for county judge and if he failed to do so he would be laid off.

You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that this is in the Democratic primary. The attempt is made to purge Democrats as well as Republicans.

Affiant states that he informed Clarence Moore that he would not vote for Ray Huddleston and on Saturday, November 5, 1938, this affiant was discharged.

Affiant further states that just before the primary the said Clarence Moore brought beer on the project for Ray Huddleston and that Ray Huddleston came to the project about 30 minutes after the beer arrived.

Here is another one:

STATE OF MISSOURI,
County of Howell, ss:

Ted Harris, being duly sworn upon his oath, states that in the spring of 1938 he was working on a W. P. A. project under W. L. Stevens, who was foreman.

A different foreman and a different project, you will observe.

Affiant states that Stevens requested that he join the Young Democratic Club and pay 50 cents a month to such organization. Affiant informed him that he was not financially able to do so. Affiant states that sometime thereafter he was discharged.

Recently affiant states that he applied for another job on the W. P. A. and talked with W. L. Stevens, who is county supervisor; that Stevens asked him how he was on the county court; that he told Stevens he did not know and that Stevens told him that they wanted to beat Bill McDaniel for southern county judge for the reason McDaniel would not cooperate with the W. P. A.

Affiant states that they did not put him back on the W. P. A. work.

Affiant states that he is a Republican.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
County of Howell, ss:

I, Charles Land, of Lanton, Mo., being duly sworn upon my oath and according to law, state that I was employed on project No. 976 of W. P. A. in Howell County, Mo., before the primary and until November 5, 1938.

Shortly prior to the primary, W. L. Stevens, one of the bosses of the W. P. A., made a talk to the W. P. A. workers on the job and told us that if we did not vote for Clark and Billings it meant our job. This talk was made a few minutes after 4 o'clock.

Later one of the workers on the job inquired how I voted and I stated that I voted as I damned pleased.

That is the kind of constituency I represent. [Applause.] And they will not sell their souls for a mess of pottage. They are not easily scared, either. They love their liberty and like their fathers will fight and die for it.

On November 5, 1938, I was discharged and the slip showed it was "unsatisfactory service," although my foreman, Ed Threlkeld, said my work was satisfactory.

I am a Republican.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
County of Howell, ss:

I, Scott Johnson, being duly sworn upon my oath and according to law, state that before the primary, 1938, I worked on a W. P. A. project on which John Ruby was foreman.

These W. P. A. foremen in my district are thicker than fleas on a dog. They receive the big checks and large salaries for doing the white-collared work while the poor boys with pick and shovel come out the little end of the horn.

Affiant states that shortly before the primary Billy Williams, the water boy, came to him and wanted to know from this affiant how he was going to vote. Affiant states that he asked him, "Who wants to know?"; and Williams said that John Ruby did.

They go about it in an indirect manner, in certain instances.

Affiant states that he told him that he would vote as he pleased.

On Saturday, November 5, 1938, affiant states he was discharged on the ground that his services were unsatisfactory.

Affiant states that he is a Republican.

I do not want to take your time reading any more of these, except perhaps one.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
County of Howell, ss:

R. W. Baker, who lives in Howell County, and receives his mail, Route 1, Cabool, Mo., being duly sworn upon his oath and according to law, states that he was employed since February 28, 1938, on a W. P. A. road project under Vern Simpkins, foreman.

Affiant states that on October 31, 1938, about a week before the general election, Vern Simpkins came to him and said, "You are an ex-service man, Baker, and I want to talk to you. Come and get in the car and let's go for a little drive." Affiant states that this occurred while he was on the job, and that he went with Simpkins. Simpkins said while on the trip, "Baker, about 99 percent of my men are Democrats and I'm a Democrat, and unless you so declare, I'll have to put you down as a Republican." Affiant states that he replied, "I'm a nonpartisan and I vote for the man. It's usually a split ticket."

Affiant states on November 5, 1938, he received his discharge for "unsatisfactory service." Affiant states that as far as he knows he was the only man on this project, which employed about 60 men, who was discharged.

Affiant further states that the foreman or anyone else never made any complaint about his work while he was on W. P. A. Affiant further states that he has six small children, the oldest being 10 years old.

R. W. BAKER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of November 1938.

[SEAL]

RAY DAUGHERTY, Notary Public.

My commission expires April 15, 1939.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
County of Howell, ss:

I, Alfred Andrews, being duly sworn upon my oath, say that I am a Democrat and that until recently I was a W. P. A. worker in Oregon County on a road project and that Clarence Moore was the foreman.

Affiant states that shortly before the primary election 1938 that Clarence Moore informed this affiant that it was necessary for him to vote for Ray Huddleston for candidate for county judge, and if he failed to do so, he would be laid off.

Affiant states that he informed Clarence Moore that he would not vote for Ray Huddleston, and on Saturday, November 5, 1938, this affiant was discharged.

Affiant further states that just before the primary the said Clarence Moore brought beer on the project for Ray Huddleston and that Ray Huddleston came to the project about 30 minutes after the beer arrived.

ALFRED ANDREWS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of November 1938.

[SEAL]

RAY P. DAUGHERTY,
Notary Public.

My commission expires April 15, 1939.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
County of Howell, ss:

Ted Harris, being duly sworn upon his oath, states that in the spring of 1938 he was working on a W. P. A. project under W. L. Stevens, who was foreman. Affiant states that Stevens requested that he join the Young Democrat Club and pay 50 cents a month to such organization. Affiant informed him that he was not financially able to do so. Affiant states that sometime thereafter he was discharged.

Recently, affiant states that he applied for another job on the W. P. A. and talked with W. L. Stevens, who is county supervisor; that Stevens asked him how he was on the county court; that he told Stevens he did not know and that Stevens told him that they wanted to beat Bill McDaniel for Southern County judge for the reason McDaniel would not cooperate with the W. P. A.

Affiant states that they did not put him back on the W. P. A. work.

Affiant states that he is a Republican.

TED HARRIS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of November 1938.

[SEAL]

RAY P. DAUGHERTY,
Notary Public.

My commission expires April 15, 1939.

STATE OF MISSOURI,
County of Howell, ss:

I, Charles Land, of Lanton, Mo., being duly sworn upon my oath and according to law, state that I was employed on project No. 976 of W. P. A. in Howell County, Mo., before the primary and until November 5, 1938.

Shortly prior to the primary W. L. Stevens, one of the bosses of the W. P. A., made a talk to the W. P. A. workers on the job and told us that if we did not vote for Clark and Billings it meant our job. This talk was made a few minutes after 4 o'clock.

Later one of the workers on the job inquired how I voted and I stated that I voted as I damned pleased.

On November 5, 1938, I was discharged and the slip showed it was for "unsatisfactory service," although my foreman, Ed Threlkeld, said my work was satisfactory.
I am a Republican.

CHARLES C. LAND.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of November 1938.

[SEAL]

RAY P. DAUGHERTY,
Notary Public.

My commission expires April 15, 1939.

STATE OF MISSOURI,

County of Howell, ss:

I, Scott Johnson, being duly sworn upon my oath and according to law, state that before the primary, 1938, I worked on a W. P. A. project on which John Ruby was foreman.

Affiant states that shortly before the primary Billy Williams, the water boy, came to him and wanted to know from this affiant how he was going to vote. Affiant states that he asked him, "Who wants to know?"; and Williams said that John Ruby did. Affiant states that he told him that he would vote as he pleased.

On Saturday, November 5, 1938, affiant states he was discharged on the ground that his services were unsatisfactory.

Affiant states that he is a Republican.

SCOTT JOHNSON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7th day of November 1938.

[SEAL]

RAY P. DAUGHERTY,
Notary Public.

My commission expires April 15, 1939.

STATE OF MISSOURI,

County of Howell, ss:

R. W. Baker, who lives in Howell County, and receives his mail, route 1, Cabool, Mo., being duly sworn upon his oath and according to law, states that he was employed since February 28, 1938, on a W. P. A. road project under Vern Simpkins, foreman.

Affiant states that on October 31, 1938, about a week before the general election, Vern Simpkins came to him and said, "You are an ex-service man, Baker, and I want to talk to you. Come and get in the car and let's go for a little drive." Affiant states that this occurred while he was on the job, and that he went with Simpkins. Simpkins said while on the trip, "Baker, about 99 percent of my men are Democrats and I'm a Democrat, and unless you so declare I'll have to put you down as a Republican." Affiant states that he replied, "I'm a nonpartisan and I vote for the man. It's usually a split ticket."

Affiant states on November 5, 1938, he received his discharge for "unsatisfactory service." Affiant states that as far as he knows he was the only man on this project, which employed about 60 men, who was discharged.

Affiant further states that the foreman or anyone else never made any complaint about his work while he was on W. P. A. Affiant further states that he has six small children, the oldest being 10 years old.

R. W. BAKER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of November 1938.

[SEAL]

RAY P. DAUGHERTY,
Notary Public.

My commission expires April 15, 1939.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to clutter up the RECORD with all the affidavits I have and the dozens of letters which appear in my files; but I do want to include those I have read and perhaps two or three others, and, with the unanimous consent of the committee, I will do that for the benefit of the membership of the House. All these affidavits were subscribed and sworn to under seal before Ray P. Daugherty, notary public, Howell County, Mo., on and since November 5, 1938.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATE OF MISSOURI,

County of Howell, ss:

Frank Ramsey, being duly sworn upon his oath and according to law, states that he was employed on the W. P. A. at Myrtle, Oregon County, Mo., and that Leonard Hall was his foreman.

Affiant states that shortly before the primary in August 1938, that Leonard Hall came to him and told him to vote for Billings for supreme court judge. Affiant states that Hall said, "You know what it means." Affiant states that he informed Hall that he was for Douglas.

Affiant states that on Saturday, November 5, 1938, he was discharged on the ground that his services were "unsatisfactory."

Affiant states that his foreman stated that his services were "satisfactory."

Affiant states that he is a Republican.

FRANK RAMSEY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of November 1938.

[SEAL]

RAY P. DAUGHERTY,
Notary Public.

My commission expires April 15, 1939.

NOTICE OF TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT

Name: Rhodes, Sylvester. Address: West Plains, Mo. Identification No. 2946-1075. Case No. 774. Date: 11-1-38. Sex: M. Race: W. Certified. Now working as laborer at West Plains school, Howell County.

Effective 5 p. m. on 11-5-38 your employment will be terminated from project No. 5274 for the following reason: Unsatisfactory work.

JOHN WRIGHT,
JOHN M. McCANN.

Approved by Julian E. Wheeler

STATE OF MISSOURI,

County of Howell, ss:

I, Sylvester Rhodes, state that in the spring of 1938 I was working on a W. P. A. project under W. L. Stevens, who was the foreman. He came to me and asked that I join the Young Democrat Club. I told him I could not afford to do so. He said it would not cost much, just \$1 per month. Later he asked me on two occasions and I told him I did not believe that way. Soon thereafter I was transferred to work at West Plains on the school buildings under W. P. A. On Saturday, November 5, 1938, I received notice in writing from John Wright, district engineer of W. P. A., that I was discharged for unsatisfactory service. I inquired of my foreman if my work had been satisfactory and he stated that my work was satisfactory and he was not consulted about my discharge. Last week the timekeeper on the job brought a Democrat ballot on the job and the foreman explained to some of the boys that that was the way to vote.

I have a wife and nine children and need the work, but do not feel I should be compelled to vote for something I do not believe in, in order to hold a job.

Dated this 5th day of November, 1938.

SYLVESTER RHODES.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of November 1938.

[SEAL]

RAY P. DAUGHERTY.

My commission expires April 15, 1939.

We, the undersigned, being duly sworn, state that we heard the foreman on the 5th day of November tell Sylvester Rhodes that his work had always been satisfactory.

OTHE BREEDLOVE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of November 1938.

[SEAL]

RAY P. DAUGHERTY.

My commission expires April 15, 1939.

COUNTY OF HOWELL,

State of Missouri, ss:

Louie Clark, being duly sworn, states that he worked on W. P. A. with Wade Baldrige, foreman, and that shortly before the primary election, he had a discussion with other boys on the job in which he stated he was a Republican. Later Wade Baldrige came to him and made the statement that they all had better vote right this time or you will lose your job.

Affiant states he voted the Republican ticket at the primary and on Saturday, November the 5th, was discharged on the ground of "unsatisfactory service," although no complaint had been made as to his work.

LOUIE CLARK.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21st day of November 1938.

[SEAL]

RAY P. DAUGHERTY,

Notary Public.

My commission expires April 15, 1939.

Mr. SHORT. No politics in relief?

Mr. Chairman, immediately after the adjournment of the last session of the Seventy-fifth Congress the President of the United States got on a 10-Pullman-car air-conditioned special train and by taking circuitous routes went from one coast of this country to the other, through various States, urging the electorate to return only 100-percent "yes" men and rubber stamps to the two Houses of the United States Congress. I am glad to say certain particular Members of Congress and other candidates who received his personal blessings down in Texas, Georgia, South Carolina, Maryland, and elsewhere were left at home because Americans are patriots before partisans. [Applause.]

When he reached California he got on one of these \$10,000,-000 cruisers and went out on a fishing trip. We have the "fishingest" President that any country ever had. He fishes for suckers both on land and in the sea. He goes out fishing for votes off the rear end of air-conditioned Pullmans and off the decks of new cruisers escorted by battleships. I do not know how much these periodical fishing expeditions have cost the voters and taxpayers of this Nation, but he went down the Pacific, through the Panama Canal, up the Atlantic, got off down in the southeastern part of our country and personally

invaded Georgia and South Carolina in the Democratic primaries, a precedent and practice upon which George Washington, the Father of his Country, frowned as meddling interference of the Executive in a congressional election. He urged the voters down there not to return two able and distinguished men to the Senate of the United States. Of course the voters had sense enough to choose their President but not enough to choose their Senators without the providential wisdom of their President.

I do not have to tell you that these new dealers have used relief funds to cut the throats or attempt to cut the throats of life-long Democrats who were fighting the battles of the party of Thomas Jefferson when a lot of these little nitwit new dealers were scarcely dry behind the ears.

Mr. Roosevelt did not want WALTER GEORGE sent back to the Senate, although WALTER GEORGE had represented Georgia for 18 years in that body with distinction and honor to both himself and his constituents. He did not want him because WALTER GEORGE had a mind of his own and voted against the court-packing bill. The President goes down in a primary and discharges some of the appointees of that distinguished Senator and uses work-relief funds in an attempt to purge some of the most able and oldest members of his own party. Then he has the unmitigated gall to shake hands with the Senator and, after acknowledging he is a fine gentleman and a great scholar, states, "God bless you, Walter." What he really meant to say was "God ——— you, Walter." You know what I mean. But Georgia has patriots.

Mr. Chairman, the prime purger did not want "Cotton" ED SMITH sent back from South Carolina because "Cotton" ED SMITH has a mind of his own. For 30 years "Cotton" ED SMITH had represented the people of the great State of South Carolina with distinction and honor to the people of South Carolina, who showed their independent judgment, their unconquerable courage, and their good conscience by sending him back. "Cotton" ED SMITH is one of the best friends that the American farmer has.

Then, to top it off, the President invaded the great free State of Maryland. He did not want MILLARD TYDINGS sent back; MILLARD TYDINGS, who has a marvelous war record, who bared his breast to the bullets of the enemy in defense of his country, who has served heroically the State of Maryland for 12 years in the United States Senate. He wanted to purge MILLARD TYDINGS for the same reason he wanted to purge WALTER GEORGE and ED SMITH, because TYDINGS could not swallow some of this cockeyed New Deal stuff any more than I can.

The President promised the voters of that great State two bridges across Chesapeake Bay. It is a wonder he did not promise them to span the Atlantic or build a bridge to the moon. He said, in effect, "I will build you two bridges across Chesapeake Bay if you will defeat MILLARD TYDINGS and send my protégé to the United States Senate." If that is not an open and unblushing attempt at bribery of the American electorate with the taxpayers' money, then I cannot understand the English language. It is comforting to know the people of Maryland still can distinguish between morality and immorality.

The President in his message to us the other day, his annual message to Congress, said, "I do not regard a penny of this money wasted." Oh, yes?

After wasting millions on the foolish and futile attempt to harness the moonbeams and the tides of the Atlantic Ocean at Passamaquoddy Bay, that has been given up as a useless and foolish expenditure since Maine went Republican and refused to be bought. Not a penny wasted, when millions more of the taxpayers' funds are buried in a ditch down in Florida, a project that has been abandoned, when the people in the south half of Florida did not want the canal to begin with, and when it fills up with sand just as fast as they can dig it out. Millions more thrown to the winds on fantastic schemes of the starry-eyed crystal gazers.

What is this W. P. A. for? Ostensibly for relief, but in reality to be used as a slush fund. That is what I branded the \$4,880,000,000 appropriation. That is why I voted against

it, and against the other billions since appropriated. I shall not furnish my enemy with a weapon to destroy me. I voted against them all.

Spending relief money is merely giving the patient "a shot in the arm." It kills the pain temporarily but does not effect a permanent cure.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I wish to thank the gentleman from New York for his unbounded generosity.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to my distinguished friend from Missouri.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Does the gentleman know that in my district the W. P. A. workers had on the backs of their automobiles while on the job signs of my opponent in the primary, and does the gentleman know that the foremen held meetings on the job asking the W. P. A. workers to beat me, and as a result, I came back here with a margin of only 17,000 votes? [Applause.]

Mr. SHORT. I wish to congratulate the gentleman and say that although he is a Democrat, he has shown independent judgment here on the floor, and was returned to Congress by Republicans as well as by Democrats in his district in my State of Missouri.

None of us opposes relief for those who are in destitution and want, but oh, the camouflage screen. Fifty years hence, Mr. Chairman, when history is written with open eyes and without prejudice, when the stark-naked truth is told, in my humble, perhaps useless, but at least honest and conscientious judgment, this whole sad, sordid story of relief will go down as one of the blackest, dirtiest, most dastardly, diabolical, and despicable chapters in American history.

You do not help people by robbing them of their initiative and their self-respect. What future is there for any man on W. P. A. at starvation wages? I know the fathers and mothers in my district do not want to see their boys and girls, their sons and daughters, work their way through high school and college and, after receiving their diplomas, have nothing to look forward to but to go upon the relief rolls of the Nation; yet that is about the highest ambition any young man or woman in this country can have under this New Deal, simply to depend upon political pull through temporary political expediency to go on W. P. A. or relief at starvation wages.

What are you going to do about it? You will never have economic recovery in this country, you will never have the people at peace and in contentment, until you free private business from the present well-founded and justifiable fears it has. If we would repeal outright the tax upon undistributed profits and upon capital gains, if we would cease this excessive governmental regulation from a centralized bureaucracy, if we would stop Government subsidized competition with private industry and repeal the reciprocal trade agreements, if we would take a firm position against lawlessness, the C. I. O. sit-down strikes, and guarantee every American citizen the right to hold his property and never lose it without due process of law, if we would amend the one-sided Wagner Act and curb the powers of the N. L. R. B., if we would cut governmental expenditures to the bone in order to relieve the over-burdened American taxpayer, if we would free the farmer of compulsory crop control, if we would give the managers of big business and of little business to understand that they could make a reasonable and legitimate profit and run their own businesses in their own way, then you would see the wheels of industry start to turn, you would see smoke come out of the chimneys in the industrial centers of America, you would see this vast army of unemployed who have been forced through no fault of their own upon the relief rolls and the W. P. A. rolls at subsistence and starvation wages go back to good jobs at decent wages in private industry, and you would see private capital, billions upon billions of it, come

out of hiding and go back once more into an open, free, and flowing investment market. Not until that day can we ever hope to have an end to unemployment, a restoration of the American spirit, and economic recovery in this country. [Applause.]

I am not going to vote to give any man in the White House, be he Republican, Democrat, or new dealer, blank checks in the huge sums a supine and subservient Congress in the past few years has turned over to our Chief Executive, sums which he can spend at any time in any manner he sees fit. "This," as often I have said, "is more power than any good man should want and certainly is more power than any bad man should have." I trust the membership of this House will rise up on its hind legs and exercise its constitutional prerogatives and show some guts as well as intelligence in voting down this proposition. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I hope to approach the discussion of the particular phase of this question to which I desire to call your attention without any suggestion of political partisanship. I am not particularly impressed by any effort to use the issue which is here pending and which affects so vitally so many millions of American people for political advantage. I feel that the membership of the House is not particularly impressed by the political sharpshooting in connection with this debate.

In that particular I wish to commend the example set by the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who in the address he delivered to you this morning made no statement which can possibly be construed as of a political nature. He adhered closely to the facts as he understood the facts, making reference to some which may not be considered in some quarters to reflect favorably upon the incumbent administration, but at the same time not endeavoring to do otherwise than bring to you the real information which you ought to have in endeavoring to pass upon this question, without any suggestion of political partisanship.

On Tuesday morning of this week I inserted in the RECORD, with the permission of the House, certain statistics with regard to the minimum and maximum wage rates applicable in the different States of the United States and the District of Columbia to the various classes of W. P. A. labor. I desire to make reference in a brief way to some of the facts disclosed by the table which was then inserted.

I feel that I am bringing to your attention now a matter which should have the careful thought of every Member of the House, and I earnestly request that you may give your attention not only to what I say but to the statistics to which I have made reference, appearing on page 167 of the RECORD.

If you will examine these statistics, you will find that in the class of unskilled labor the rates of pay by the Works Progress Administration vary from a low of 18 cents per hour in the State of Tennessee to a high of \$1.025 per hour in the State of Illinois. In other words, for the performance of the same character of labor by the same type of laborer in the two States mentioned, the one laboring in Tennessee receives for his work only 18 cents per hour, whereas the one in Illinois may be paid, and in some instances has been paid, as high as \$1.025 per hour.

Passing to the pay of intermediate laborers, it is observed that this varies from a low of 23 cents per hour in Tennessee to a high of \$1.57 per hour in New York City.

The pay of skilled laborers varies from a low of 31 cents per hour in Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia to a high of \$2.25 per hour in the State of New Jersey.

You will understand that in mentioning the maximums in New Jersey and in Illinois and in New York City I am not stating that all labor of the type described receives that maximum wage, but I am saying that in accordance with these statistics furnished me by the Works Progress Administration itself, some laborers of the types mentioned receive these maximums in the various areas to which I have made reference.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. TARVER. Not for the moment; I will yield later.

Under the head of professional and technical labor it is observed that the minimum hourly wage is 34 cents per hour in the States of Alabama, Kentucky, and Virginia, and ranges upward to a maximum—listen to this, if you please—of \$3.03 per hour in the State of Pennsylvania.

Is it conceivable, leaving aside the question of discrimination as between men who are of similar abilities and who are similarly situated in a financial way, that the Government of the United States, as a matter of public grace, in endeavoring to furnish a man who is unemployed with a means of livelihood for himself and his family, should pay for his services anywhere in this country \$3.03 per hour which, for an 8-hour day, would amount to in excess of \$24 per day?

These are simple illustrations of the manifold injustices which appear in the statistical table I have had inserted in the RECORD. It is a situation which ought to be corrected. I have an idea as to how it ought to be corrected which I expect to explain later on in my remarks, but I want to say here that I am not wedded to that idea and if you have or are able to study out, pending the consideration of this bill, a better method by which these manifest injustices may be corrected, I shall as earnestly support your plan as I would like for you to do mine if you are unable to conceive of a better one.

These discriminations in pay of W. P. A. employees are sought to be justified upon a variety of different grounds. If they may be justified at all it would have to be, in my judgment, upon the basis of a difference in the cost of living in the various localities where the wage rates to which I have made reference are in effect, but in that connection I call your attention to some information I have received from Dr. Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, resulting from a survey made by the Works Progress Administration itself of living costs in 31 cities widely scattered throughout the United States. I hope to be able to obtain permission to insert this information, which is comparatively brief, in the RECORD.

I call your attention to the fact that in table 1, the estimated cost of living for a four-person manual-worker family, at maintenance level, as defined by the Works Progress Administration, in the city of Atlanta, Ga., is \$1,300.68 per annum and that in the city of New York the amount is \$1,385.94 per annum, only slightly larger than the estimated cost of living of the same family in the city of Atlanta, and yet in the city of New York, as you will observe from the table to which I have made reference and which has been inserted in the RECORD, the maximum wage pay for unskilled labor is 93 cents per hour, the minimum wage pay for the same type of labor is 46½ cents per hour, whereas in the State of Georgia the maximum pay for unskilled labor is 30 cents per hour and the minimum is 20 cents per hour. In other words, in the city of New York, which has substantially the same living costs as has the city of Atlanta, the unskilled W. P. A. laborer may receive more than three times as much for performing the same character of work as he may be paid in the city of Atlanta. I submit that any system which permits of that degree of discrimination is unfair and that it ought to be corrected by appropriate legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I fully recognize the injustice and the discrimination in wages paid by W. P. A. as between southern labor and northern labor, but the gentleman from Georgia will recall that when we had before the House at the last session the wage and hour bill, the advocates of that measure and also the administration, including the President, took the position there should be no discrimination in minimum wages among laboring people throughout the entire United States.

Mr. TARVER. I recall that very well. I do not agree with the gentleman that the only discrimination in the matter of these wages is as between Southern and Northern

States. If the gentleman will examine the table to which I have repeatedly made reference, he will find discriminations exist as between other States of the country as well as between the States of the South and those of the North and northeastern portions of the country. I believe one result which followed the discussion of the wage and hour bill last year was the insertion on page 4, section 9, of the following language:

SEC. 9. The rates of pay for persons engaged upon projects under the appropriations in this title shall be not less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Works Progress Administration: *Provided*, That if minimum rates of pay for persons employed by private employers in any occupation are established by or pursuant to the authority conferred by any labor-standards act enacted at the third session of the Seventy-fifth Congress, not less than the minimum rates of pay so established shall be paid to persons in similar occupations in the same locality employed on projects under the appropriation in subsection 1 of section 1 of this title.

In other words, the Congress intended by this language, although it may be susceptible through strained construction to some other interpretation, to provide that if at that session of Congress there should be enacted a labor-standards act providing fixed minimum wages applicable in all sections of the country; that the minimum wage of W. P. A. workers doing substantially the same kind of work as other unskilled laborers should not be less than the minimum wage fixed in the Labor Standards Act, and the Works Progress Administration has paid no attention whatever to that requirement, contained in the Work Relief Act enacted last year. If it had, it would have been impossible for it to have paid in the gentleman's State of Tennessee as low as 18 cents per hour for unskilled labor.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. What explanation was made of that terrific discrepancy between the wages paid in the South and the North. I mean by the Works Progress Administration. What did they say?

Mr. TARVER. I have never heard the Works Progress Administration undertake to explain it. I asked a member of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations—I am not a member of that subcommittee—whether or not in the hearings that were had on this pending bill there had been an effort to bring out the facts in regard to these apparently totally unjustified discriminations, and I was advised that no such effort had been made. After receiving that information, I myself communicated with the Works Progress Administration and secured the data which I am undertaking at this time to present to the House in the hope that it may result in the correction of what is undoubtedly a very unfair and unjust situation.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. These excessive high rates per hour must be for some professional writers or professional men. Is not that true?

Mr. TARVER. I think that so far as the technical and professional work which I have referred to is concerned, the gentleman's statement is probably correct. Of course, that could not apply to unskilled laborers. So far as the professional and technical work is concerned, I have never agreed with the idea that because a man who is out of employment is a lawyer, a doctor, or writer he ought to get many times as much per hour as the poor fellow who is a common laborer gets, and who is likewise obliged to appeal to the Government for aid in his effort to make a livelihood for himself and his family. If great need makes it necessary for the Government to intervene in order to protect human beings from suffering, then no greater consideration ought to be accorded to the man who is skilled, whether as a lawyer, a doctor, or writer, than to the man who is a common laborer, when they are compelled to appeal to the Government as an act of grace for aid to keep their families from suffering for the necessities of life. But if that position is not well-founded, then certainly there is no reason why, as within this same class of people, these professional and technical men, some should be paid 34 cents an hour in one State and others \$3.03 an

hour in another State. It is significant that in the State of Pennsylvania, where this outrageously high rate of \$3.03 per hour was in some cases paid, that in 1937 the total W. P. A. expenditures were \$214,000,000, approximately, whereas in all of the 11 Southern States combined the W. P. A. expenditures for that year were only \$210,000,000.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. The gentleman has performed a very excellent service in fighting discriminations. Does the gentleman think correction of these discriminations can be made by Executive action or that they should be made by congressional action?

Mr. TARVER. I have prepared an amendment which I desire to submit to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union at the proper time, either in this language or in some other language.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. The gentleman believes that the Congress should make the rule?

Mr. TARVER. I think so. The amendment which I have prepared reads as follows:

Provided further, That the appropriations herein made shall not be available unless and until rates of pay of employees of the Works Progress Administration are so fixed by appropriate administrative order as to eliminate differentials in rates of pay exceeding 25 percent of the maximum rates between different States or areas of the same general type in the several States.

I may say that the American Federation of Labor, as evidenced by a letter to me from Mr. William Green, printed on page 6680 of the RECORD of the third session of the Seventy-fifth Congress, is opposed, and has announced its unqualified opposition, to any discrimination whatever in wages paid in different sections of the country, as between the same types of workers. I am not of the opinion that the discrimination permitted should be as large as 25 percent. I think that some differentials should be permitted, perhaps to the extent of 10 percent; but in an effort to reach a basis upon which I might hope for the support of men who are not willing to go so far as I would be willing to go, I have written into the amendment the provision that the discrimination shall not be greater than 25 percent, which it seems to me is so eminently just that it ought to attract the support of every fair-minded Member of this House.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. I am sure the gentleman wants to make a full and complete statement.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. HEALEY. When the gentleman has given us the rates for skilled and professional labor, he neglects to say that there is a limitation on the hours that those men may work in a month. That is, there is a certain amount of money that those men can earn for the month.

Mr. TARVER. There has been no neglect, may I say. I have simply been prevented, by reason of not being able to say everything I wanted to say at once, in reaching that particular subject matter. As disclosed by the report of the Byrns special committee, filed in the Congress on the 20th of April 1938, these higher-paid employees are permitted to work only long enough to make a certain so-called security wage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Georgia 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. A carpenter in the District of Columbia, for example, was permitted to work only 42 hours per month. He was paid \$1.75 per hour, for a total so-called security wage of \$73.50. It was also disclosed in the report of that committee that in the majority of cases which had been investigated by the committee, these so-called higher type of employees, after earning their security wage, had worked the rest of the month for private employers. That discloses a condition which is essentially unfair and contrary to the purposes of this program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am interested in and largely in agreement with what the gentleman has been saying. I say that because I have had an experience in my own State. My very good colleague and friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. FADDIS, who represents Greene County, adjacent to Monongalia County that I represent, knows, as I know, that the rate of pay for unskilled, intermediate, and skilled workers is different in West Virginia than it is in Pennsylvania. It is lower in my State than it is in the gentleman's State. I have diligently and energetically, not over a period of months but over a period of years, tried to impress upon the officials of the Works Progress Administration that the climatic and living conditions were identical in the two districts, but I have gotten nowhere. I do want to say that it is a serious problem and one that I compliment the gentleman upon attacking in such a fair manner.

Mr. TARVER. As I endeavored to point out a while ago, the idea that these discriminations are altogether against the South and in favor of the rest of the country is absolutely fallacious. All you need do is examine the table of wages paid, which I have placed in the RECORD, in order to find that there are multitudinous discriminations as between many of the States of the Union lying north of the Mason and Dixon line. This is not a sectional question at all. It is a question of trying to be fair. We are undertaking to pass on the rights of some two or three millions of unfortunate people who have had to call upon the Government in order to live. Disregarding the question of sectional advantage, let us consider these men as needy, unfortunate human beings, who are entitled to the sympathetic consideration of the Congress, and be fair to them, and not say to a man who digs a ditch or builds a road in Georgia, "You shall work for 20 cents an hour, whereas if you do the same work in Illinois, you might get \$1.02½ an hour."

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the fact that there are about 12,000,000 men out of jobs, and the maximum number taken care of by W. P. A. has been 3,000,000, does not the gentleman think, in view of the limitation of funds, it will be good to base the amount of salary paid on the number of mouths to be fed? Why should a single carpenter get a W. P. A. relief job and get \$90 a month, and a man who happens to be a laborer, if he is fortunate enough to get a laborer's job, get only \$60 a month, when he may have seven mouths to feed?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman's statement has many elements of fairness. Certainly the purpose of the program is to prevent human suffering, and not to bring in large wages for one particular citizen or group of citizens, out of proportion to the needs which that citizen or that group of citizens might have, in order to maintain a fair living standard.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. I am interested in the gentleman's proposed amendment, and I should like to understand for myself and perhaps for other Members, if the gentleman's amendment is going to apply as well between skilled and unskilled as it does between sections?

Mr. TARVER. The amendment which I propose intends only to prevent discrimination as within the four classes of labor: The unskilled, the intermediate, the skilled, the professional and technical. If the gentleman thinks that an amendment of the character which he has just discussed would more properly meet the situation, I would appreciate his taking the trouble to prepare it and offering it upon the floor. As I said a while ago, I am not sure that my amendment reaches the trouble. I am simply sure that we have not here corrected the injustices which ought to be corrected in some way. If this is not the way to correct them, then I call upon you men, if you are interested in fairness and justice, to try to work out some way yourselves and present it to the House upon consideration of the bill, some way which you think will achieve the proper result. [Applause.]

In conclusion, may I say that I think you will find the following statement and tables regarding the costs of living in different cities of great interest and value:

ESTIMATED INTERCITY DIFFERENCES IN COSTS OF LIVING
(Bureau of Labor Statistics)

In March 1935 the Division of Social Research of the Works Progress Administration conducted a study of comparative living costs in 59 cities. The purpose of this study was to determine the cost of a uniform level of living in a large number of places at the same time, and how these costs compared from one city to another. Quantity budgets were constructed by the Works Progress Administration to represent the needs of families at two levels of living—the basic maintenance level and emergency level. An identical budget for each of these levels of living, with certain adjustments in the fuel, ice, and transportation lists to take account of climatic and other local conditions, was used in each of the cities.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor cooperated with the Division of Social Research of the Works Progress Administration in obtaining the prices necessary to compute the costs of these budgets. Insofar as possible prices for identical commodities were obtained in each city. Details of this study and a description of the goods and services included in these budgets can be found in the report of the Works Progress Administration, Intercity Differences in Costs of Living in March 1935, 59 Cities, Research Monograph XII, a copy of which may be obtained from the Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, Washington, D. C.

Since March 1935, the date of the Works Progress Administration study, no attempt has been made to price these budgets in order to get an intercity comparison of costs as of a later date. Estimates may be made, however, for the 31 cities covered by both the Works Progress Administration study and the Bureau of Labor Statistics' studies of changes in the cost of goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics constructs cost of living indexes by pricing quarterly, in each of 32 large cities, a list of the goods most important in the spending of families of wage earners and lower-salaried workers, as shown by the Bureau's study of actual expenditures of these families in 1917-19. In the construction of the index, price changes, noted from period to period, are weighted according to the importance of these items in family spending, as shown by that study. These indexes can be used to show changes from time to time in any one city, but cannot be used to make a comparison of costs between cities, nor to show actual living costs in any one city at any given time. Further information about these indexes may be found in the pamphlet, Changes in Cost of Living, issued quarterly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

By applying the Bureau of Labor Statistics' indexes of living costs, which show changes in costs from time to time, to the Works Progress Administration data on intercity differences in costs in March 1935, an approximate intercity comparison of costs as of a current date may be obtained. Since the cost of living indexes of the Bureau of Labor Statistics are based on a budget weighted differently from the budget used in the Works Progress Administration study, when the two sets of figures are combined the resulting estimates of intercity differences in costs are merely approximations.

The attached tables show the result of combining the two sets of figures. Table 1 presents estimated cost of living for a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level, as defined by the Works Progress Administration, in 31 large cities, as of the most recent date for which the Bureau of Labor Statistics has prepared indexes. Table 2 presents these data as indexes on a base of the cost in Washington, D. C., as of that date as 100. These aggregates and indexes were computed by applying the Bureau of Labor Statistics' data on changes in the cost of each group of the goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers from March 15, 1935, to the current date to the dollar costs as of March 15, 1935, prepared by the Works Progress Administration, in its study of intercity differences in cost of living.

TABLE 1.—Estimated cost of living for a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level, as defined by the Works Progress Administration, in 31 large cities, as of Sept. 15, 1938¹

City	Total	Food	Clothing	Housing	Fuel and light	Furniture, furnishings, household equipment	Miscellaneous
Atlanta.....	\$1,300.68	\$432.34	\$153.69	\$287.30	\$62.90	\$33.11	\$331.34
Baltimore.....	1,339.95	463.55	152.10	248.17	70.13	34.05	371.95
Birmingham.....	1,235.50	435.64	156.64	227.36	56.12	31.16	328.58
Boston.....	1,350.50	465.90	168.54	290.45	86.94	34.12	334.55
Buffalo.....	1,283.81	423.06	171.19	241.19	76.42	35.40	336.55
Chicago.....	1,419.46	452.83	172.81	292.13	96.69	32.75	372.25
Cincinnati.....	1,331.88	429.35	168.05	273.09	57.88	35.68	367.83
Cleveland.....	1,427.65	451.40	194.60	294.65	71.01	34.66	391.33

¹ Computed by applying, by groups of items, the Bureau of Labor Statistics' indexes of the cost of goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers, which show changes in cost from time to time in each of the cities, to the data on differences in costs from city to city, presented by the Works Progress Administration in its publication, Intercity Differences in Costs of Living in March 1935, 59 Cities, Research Monograph XII.

TABLE 1.—Estimated cost of living for a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level, as defined by the Works Progress Administration, in 31 large cities, as of Sept. 15, 1938—Con.

City	Total	Food	Clothing	Housing	Fuel and light	Furniture, furnishings, household equipment	Miscellaneous
Denver	\$1,273.94	\$415.22	\$162.63	\$237.04	\$70.16	\$34.38	\$354.51
Detroit	1,427.58	435.75	179.92	312.14	84.53	33.88	381.36
Houston	1,250.43	429.22	164.46	244.05	41.95	36.41	334.34
Indianapolis	1,244.72	423.06	161.15	237.18	68.32	32.61	322.40
Jacksonville	1,260.44	480.02	155.51	218.28	75.92	33.44	297.27
Kansas City	1,267.21	439.43	170.24	210.25	63.28	30.58	353.43
Los Angeles	1,354.16	411.46	191.98	247.03	60.01	36.40	407.28
Memphis	1,252.77	413.13	154.67	263.21	59.83	34.68	327.25
Minneapolis	1,433.33	427.26	182.24	302.81	123.99	35.48	361.55
Mobile	1,134.11	426.12	146.75	173.75	58.84	34.17	294.48
New Orleans	1,255.96	432.99	160.87	202.59	55.97	33.68	369.86
New York	1,385.94	478.70	149.77	307.67	81.08	29.06	339.06
Norfolk	1,250.35	438.36	159.87	245.00	73.12	31.63	302.37
Philadelphia	1,330.15	446.17	162.38	254.53	70.89	32.24	363.94
Pittsburgh	1,267.64	451.59	169.88	284.74	56.35	32.61	372.47
Portland, Maine	1,272.30	454.92	176.44	200.65	94.15	34.23	311.91
Portland, Oreg.	1,285.14	439.13	187.69	193.27	68.98	34.05	362.02
Richmond	1,278.94	426.19	180.79	251.90	74.49	35.86	309.71
St. Louis	1,370.26	450.21	163.70	285.79	55.93	31.78	382.85
San Francisco	1,441.63	447.87	193.79	284.52	63.83	37.21	414.31
Scranton	1,286.17	431.52	169.70	267.29	63.69	32.74	321.23
Seattle	1,292.70	430.79	181.60	196.64	77.11	34.98	371.58
Washington, D. C.	1,439.95	465.28	167.91	355.06	73.59	34.17	343.94

TABLE 2.—Estimated indexes of cost of living for a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level, as defined by the Works Progress Administration, in 31 large cities, as of Sept. 15, 1938, on a base of the cost in Washington, D. C., as of that date as 100¹

City	Total	Food	Clothing	Housing	Fuel and light	Furniture, furnishings, household equipment	Miscellaneous
Atlanta	90.3	92.9	91.5	80.9	85.5	96.9	96.3
Baltimore	93.1	99.6	90.6	69.9	85.3	99.6	108.1
Birmingham	85.8	93.6	93.3	64.0	76.3	91.2	95.5
Boston	93.8	100.1	100.4	73.4	118.1	99.9	97.3
Buffalo	89.2	90.9	102.0	67.9	103.8	103.6	97.9
Chicago	98.6	97.3	102.9	82.3	131.4	95.8	108.2
Cincinnati	92.5	92.3	100.1	76.9	78.7	104.4	106.9
Cleveland	99.1	97.0	115.9	80.2	96.5	101.4	113.8
Denver	88.5	89.2	96.9	66.8	95.3	100.6	103.1
Detroit	99.1	93.7	107.2	87.9	114.9	99.2	110.9
Houston	86.8	92.2	97.9	68.7	87.0	106.6	97.2
Indianapolis	86.4	90.9	96.0	66.8	92.8	95.4	93.7
Jacksonville	87.5	103.2	92.6	61.5	103.2	97.9	86.4
Kansas City	88.0	94.4	101.4	59.2	86.0	99.5	102.8
Los Angeles	94.0	88.4	114.3	69.6	81.5	106.5	118.4
Memphis	87.0	88.8	92.1	74.1	81.3	101.5	95.1
Minneapolis	90.5	91.8	108.5	85.3	168.5	103.8	105.1
Mobile	78.8	91.6	87.4	48.9	80.0	100.0	85.6
New Orleans	87.2	93.1	95.8	57.1	76.1	98.6	107.5
New York	96.2	102.9	89.2	86.7	110.2	88.8	98.6
Norfolk	86.8	94.2	95.2	69.0	99.4	92.6	87.9
Philadelphia	92.4	95.9	96.7	71.7	96.3	94.4	105.8
Pittsburgh	95.0	97.1	101.2	80.2	76.6	95.4	108.3
Portland, Maine	88.4	97.8	105.1	56.5	127.9	100.2	90.7
Portland, Oreg.	89.2	94.4	111.8	54.4	93.7	99.6	105.3
Richmond	88.8	91.6	107.7	70.9	101.2	104.9	90.0
St. Louis	95.2	96.8	97.5	80.5	76.0	93.0	111.3
San Francisco	100.1	96.3	115.4	80.1	86.7	108.9	120.5
Scranton	89.3	92.7	101.1	75.3	85.5	95.8	93.4
Seattle	89.8	92.6	108.2	55.4	104.8	102.4	108.0
Washington, D. C.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹ Computing by applying, by groups of items, the Bureau of Labor Statistics' indexes of the cost of goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers, which show changes in costs from time to time in each of the cities, to the data on differences in costs from city to city, presented by the Works Progress Administration in its publication, *Inter-city Differences in Costs of Living in March 1935*, 59 Cities, Research Monograph XII.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain tables to which I have made reference.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to the fact that his request to insert matter will have to be made in the House.

Mr. TARVER. I withdraw that part of my request but renew my request for permission to revise and extend.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include cer-

tain excerpts from reports of committees appointed by the Senate and the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to submit in the House his request to insert matter.

Is there objection to the gentleman's request for permission to revise and extend his remarks?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is no Member of the House today who is not wholeheartedly in favor of adequate relief for the needy unemployed. Much as many of us may deplore policies which we believe have contributed to the present unemployment situation, policies which in our judgment have served to hamstring legitimate enterprise throughout the length and breadth of this Nation and thus to deny the opportunity for employment to millions of our fellow citizens who are now unemployed, I am sure that every Member of this House realizes under existing conditions that relief for those in need must go on, and that the Federal Government must assume its full share of responsibility in this connection.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that no fair-minded Member of this House can possibly condone or fail to condemn the present system of administration of relief which today stands before the country charged with waste and extravagance, with the scandalous use of money appropriated for the relief of those in need, and with the fostering of subversive propaganda even against the National Government itself.

When the House considered the appropriation for work and work relief for the principal portion of the present fiscal year last June the views of the minority were embodied in some detail in a minority report, from which I quote as follows:

POLITICAL EROSION IN RELIEF

Under the prevailing administrative arrangement the political exploitation of relief workers is a demoralizing national scandal.

The public records, and the personal correspondence of the Members of Congress as well, offer voluminous documentary evidence that in many States, and especially in all the principal cities, the entire relief system is operated, in large measure, as an adjunct of the local New Deal political organization.

Under threats of dismissal, relief workers have been herded systematically to the polls by precinct captains; compelled to change their party registration; forced to contribute a portion of their subsistence wages to local campaign funds; mobilized in State campaigns for active political solicitation in the interest of whatever local faction at the moment enjoys the approval and support of the Roosevelt administration.

Public scandals relating to such political trafficking in relief have been, from time to time, the subject of extended inquiry in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, West Virginia, Ohio, California, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Georgia, Maryland, Louisiana, and Florida.

In several States the public demand for elemental honesty and efficiency in the administration of relief has been carried to the courts. In other States the subject has been a matter of formal legislative inquiry.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the entire system of administration of relief has got to be revamped, in the interest not only of sound and efficient administration, but in the interest of those in need, that they may have the maximum share of every relief dollar appropriated for their benefit. Personally, I have long believed, and believe now, that a real step in the right direction will have been made if and when we put the entire relief administration on a basis of grants in aid to the several States along well-recognized principles with proper contribution on the part of each State. I hope that we may turn to some such system of administration in the near future.

In the minority report referred to, the fact was emphasized, as it has been today, that the number on the W. P. A. rolls has inevitably shown a very large increase coincident with every national election, regardless of the economic trend at the time. The record before your committee, Mr. Chairman, demonstrates clearly the same situation in respect to the recent election.

When Mr. Hopkins appeared before your committee late last spring in reference to the main appropriation for the present fiscal year, he gave an estimate of 2,600,000 people to be provided for by W. P. A. during July, August, and

September, with a possible increase to as many as 3,100,000 in the final 3 months of the calendar year.

What has happened since that time? Between May and November the Federal Reserve index of production increased 21 percent. During the same period, employment increased by about 1,100,000. A further increase in employment is anticipated by Colonel Harrington by the end of the fiscal year of about 1,500,000. The number on direct or general relief in the same period decreased by over 200,000. Transfers from W. P. A. rolls to those of the social security and other Federal assistance rolls amounted to 45,000.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out today, we find on the rolls of the W. P. A. through this 6 months' period not 2,600,000 for the first 3 months nor 3,100,000 for the last 3 months, but a total of 2,700,000 for June, 2,900,000 for July, 3,000,000 for August, 3,114,000 for September, 3,167,000 for October, and 3,257,000 on the 12th day of November, just after election day, with an immediate and substantial reduction thereafter. Generally speaking, this tendency has applied to all the States of the Union. There are some exceptions. One of those is the State of Kentucky where the peak of employment was reached on August 20, only a few days after the primary fight between Senator BARKLEY and Governor Chandler.

Reference has been made to the so-called Sheppard committee report, the recent report on senatorial campaign expenditures and the use of governmental funds. The report is the unanimous report of a committee headed by the senior Senator from Texas and the senior Senator from Massachusetts. It is 440 pages long. Others will deal with this report in some detail. I merely emphasize in passing that the report is filled with examples of scandalous use of Federal funds appropriated for those in need; that the committee states that it received hundreds of complaints; that these complaints included: First, irregularities in registration and voting; second, abuse of the Senate franking privilege; third, excessive expenditures and unreported expenditures; fourth, solicitation or assessment of Federal officials and employees either by Federal officials and employees or others for contributions in behalf of a senatorial candidate; fifth, solicitation or assessment of State officials and employees receiving any part of their pay from money appropriated by Congress for such contributions; sixth, intimidation or coercion by Federal officials and employees or others in behalf of a senatorial candidate; seventh, use of funds appropriated by Congress in behalf of a senatorial candidate; and, eighth, promising of employment in private industry in exchange for the promise to vote for certain candidates; that many of the complaints involved the W. P. A.; that the report deals in detail with especially bad conditions in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania; and that the committee makes no less than 16 specific recommendations with a view to eliminating in the future the abuse discovered as a result of its investigation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the recommendations at this point calling particular attention to recommendation No. 1:

RECOMMENDATIONS WITH INTRODUCTORY COMMENT ON WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

I. The committee in the course of its work has been compelled to give much of its attention to charges of undue political activity in connection with the administration and conduct of the Works Progress Administration in certain States. While many of these charges, after investigation, were not sustained, the committee nevertheless finds that there has been in several States, and in many forms, unjustifiable political activity in connection with the work of the Works Progress Administration in such States. The committee believes that funds appropriated by the Congress for the relief of those in need and distress have been in many instances diverted from these high purposes to political ends. The committee condemns this conduct and recommends to the Senate that legislation be prepared to make impossible, so far as legislation can do so, further offenses of this character.

II. The committee recommends legislation prohibiting contributions for any political purpose whatsoever by any person who is the beneficiary of Federal relief funds or who is engaged in the administration of relief laws of the Federal Government. The committee also recommends legislation prohibiting any person engaged in the administration of Federal relief laws from using his official authority or influence to coerce the political action of any person or body.

III. The committee recommends that section 19, title 1, of the present Work Relief Act, making it a misdemeanor for any person

knowingly, by means of fraud, force, threat, intimidation, boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, to deprive any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under the Work Relief Act, be so amended as to make such violation a felony instead of a misdemeanor.

IV. The committee recommends that all Federal relief acts should be so amended as to provide that any person who knowingly makes, furnishes, or discloses any list of persons receiving benefits under such acts or of persons engaged in the administration thereof, for delivery to a political candidate, committee, campaign manager, or employee thereof shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor.

V. The committee recommends that section 208, title 18, of the United States Code be so amended as to prohibit not only the soliciting and receiving of political contributions by officials, employees, and persons now named in that section but also by anyone acting in their behalf.

VI. The committee recommends that section 211, title 18, of the United States Code be so amended as to prohibit political contributions not only by Federal employees to any Senator or Member of or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress but also to any candidate for such offices, or to any person or committee acting with the knowledge and consent and specially in behalf of such Senator or Member of or Delegate to Congress or Resident Commissioner therein, or of any candidate for such office.

VII. The committee recommends that there should be a limitation upon contributions which individuals may make in behalf of a candidate seeking election to Federal office.

VIII. The committee recommends that section 209, title 18, of the United States Code, relating to solicitation for political contributions in any room or building occupied in the performance of official duties by any person in the employ of the Federal Government be so amended as to include solicitation by letter and telephone, as well as in person.

IX. The committee recommends the adoption by the Senate of a rule requiring all candidates for the Senate to file with the Secretary of the Senate, in response to appropriate questionnaires, a full and complete statement of receipts and expenditures incurred by or in behalf of such candidate in their campaigns for nomination as well as for election.

X. The committee recommends that section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act be so amended as to prohibit any contribution by any national bank, any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, or by any corporation engaged in interstate or foreign commerce of the United States, in connection with any primary or general election.

XI. The committee recommends that subsection (c), section 309, of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act be so amended as to require candidates to report all their campaign expenditures, including those exempted in determining the amount they are allowed to spend under the law.

XII. The committee recommends that section 310 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act be so amended as to prohibit candidates from promising work, employment, money, or other benefits in connection with public relief.

XIII. The committee recommends the enactment of a law regulating more strictly the use of the franking privilege.

XIV. The committee recommends that the Senate take under consideration the question whether or not a contribution for political purposes made either voluntarily or involuntarily by persons in the employ of the Federal Government should be permitted.

XV. The committee recommends that the Senate take under consideration the question of legislation in connection with coalition and group tickets.

XVI. The committee recommends that the Senate adopt a rule authorizing the Vice President to appoint, at the beginning of each Congress, for the duration of said Congress, a Senate committee on investigation of senatorial campaign expenditures, campaign activities, and use of governmental funds for the purpose of influencing primaries and general elections.

Reference has also been made to the report of the so-called Dies committee, the House committee investigating un-American activities and propaganda. Others will also deal with phases of this report in some detail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there is startling testimony in this report, beginning at page 31. The testimony indicates the actual fostering of subversive propaganda through the Federal writers project of the Works Progress Administration.

The committee states:

The total number of employees on this writers project was about 300. It is therefore astonishing to find that one-third of the total number of writers employed by the Government in this project were admitted Communists. We think that the explanation of the thoroughness with which the Communists have penetrated the Federal writers project is that they recognized this project as a splendid vehicle for the dissemination of class hatreds.

The evidence is very conclusive that Communist activities were carried on openly in the Federal writers project.

Much of our evidence with reference to Communist activities in the Works Progress Administration consists of documentary proof.

In this connection I quote the following excerpts from the examination of those on the staff of the project and in a position, according to the committee, to speak authoritatively:

Q. Would you go so far as to say that the tenor of the Guide from New Jersey has been class hatred and incendiary propaganda?—A. Yes.

Q. Did that Guide invariably condemn business and industry?—A. Yes.

Q. And picture them as pro-Fascist?—A. As being the enemy.

Q. As being the enemy of the masses of the people?—A. Yes.

Q. The radical element in the C. I. O. was championed in this Guide?—A. Yes.

Q. While the business people and industrial classes were pictured as enemies of the mass of the people.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you found, or do you know as a fact, that Mr. Coy and Mr. Alsberg, at the headquarters of the Federal Writers Project, have shaped their material for propaganda purposes?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Against business and against industry as a class?—A. Yes, sir; and against the Government.

Q. Against the Government itself?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. So that, is it correct to say that those in charge here in Washington have invited propaganda for the purpose of stirring up strife between capital and labor and between the races?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have heard the testimony of the two preceding witnesses, have you not?—A. Yes.

Q. What can you add to that testimony?—A. All I can add is that I can answer "yes" to every question that you have asked on whether or not the stirring up of race hatred and the stirring up of class struggle between labor and capital, between the working classes and the owning classes, is being disseminated in the United States through those guides. I can answer "yes" to that every time. The chief horror of this whole thing to me is that a situation does exist in what is manifestly a relief project, sponsored by the Government of the United States with money taken from its Treasury, which is put into the Treasury by the taxpayers.

One further point in this general connection. I refer to the statement appearing at page 132 of the hearings before your committee. The statement indicates that, in addition to minor investigations conducted locally, the W. P. A. itself has conducted no less than 64 major investigations of alleged improper political activities. These investigations resulted in the dismissal, suspension, or reprimand of 72 of the administrative or supervisory personnel in the Works Progress Administration.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it is absolutely impossible, in the light of evidence of this character in respect to the administration of relief, for the Congress of the United States to close its eyes and continue the type of administration which we now have. It seems to me that the Congress should conduct a thoroughgoing investigation into the whole situation in order that proper changes in the existing system may be made, with a view to honest and efficient administration in the future in the interest of the needy unemployed.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, every cent required for the operation of the Works Progress Administration during the winter months should be made available immediately. In my judgment, a special committee to investigate the entire situation should be appointed immediately. In my judgment, our policy as to the future should be determined in the light of the investigation and report of that committee.

An amendment to the pending bill will be offered at the proper time making it possible for the House to adopt such a policy. Adoption of the amendment means the elimination of any reduction in W. P. A. rolls between now and April 7. It means 3 months to investigate and make recommendations. It means action for the best interests of those in need in the light of 3 months' study. I hope the Members of the House will give the amendment their approval. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the question was asked of old time whether any good thing could come out of Nazareth, but the coming of something good out of Nazareth would appear to be simple compared with the modern miracle of political purity, sweetness, and light coming out

of once darkest Pennsylvania, the feudal domain of Quay, Penrose, Vare, and Joe Grundy, according to Republican spokesmen here on the floor. From what I have heard from them on the floor it is possible that the Pennsylvania Democrats are being slightly tainted by their environment, and that if they are permitted to continue in power there for 60 years more, as the Republicans were, they may bring that State into at least an approximation of its former condition under Republican rule.

From what I have heard from a good many Democrats returning to Washington, it would appear that if the voters in Pennsylvania and some of these other States got too much W. P. A. money, they were seen by somebody else later, which frequently happens, and I am afraid it is going to influence some of their votes against relief legislation.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I have not the time. I am sorry.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, a wide range of figures is being discussed for the work relief appropriation for the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30. They range all the way from \$500,000,000 to \$1,050,000,000, and there is also a proposal to be submitted by the minority to appropriate only \$300,000,000 for the period ending April 7, by which time it is conjectured by them the work relief appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1940 will have been framed, and at which time they say we can know better than we do now how much money will be needed for the last 3 months of this fiscal year.

For the first time since the inauguration of a work-relief program, and that means giving the able-bodied unemployed work instead of a dole, a drastic overhauling of work-relief methods and mechanics has assumed equal, if not greater, prominence than the amount of money involved in the program, and practically all of the proposed changes in the methods and mechanics of work relief that I have thus far seen are designed to effect a drastic curtailment and the rapid drying up of work relief, and the substitution of some other and cheaper method of caring for the unemployed workers. This has been brewing for 2 years, although many, even of the people directly involved, seemed to be blind to the storm portents. On each work-relief bill in the Seventy-fifth Congress the Republican minority submitted a motion to recommit the bill and report it back with an amendment turning unemployment relief over to the States on a dollar-matching basis. That meant the end of work. That meant the dole.

On the morning after the last election I knew the storm had broken, and I predicted that the big battle of the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress would be over work relief. While I anticipated this, it has broken with a fury beyond my expectations and the air is full of formulas as to how work relief may be curtailed and liquidated and some other form of relief substituted.

In my brief time, I want to submit to the consideration of the Committee some formulas which have occurred to me which may serve to soften the process of transition and liquidation, if fundamental changes are to be made.

It would be cruel and inhuman to make a reduction in the winter months which it is admitted would immediately throw one-half million workers out in the streets. The amount of saving involved is not large enough to justify any such inhuman course. My own course is plain and easy. I am going to support the figure asked for by the President and stated to be necessary by the Works Progress Administrator, \$875,000,000. But if a reduction is to be made, which will reduce the two-hundred-and-odd million a month which work relief has been costing during this fiscal year, to \$150,000,000 or less for the remainder of the year, then there has occurred to my mind several methods by which the reduction may be made with a minimum of hardship and suffering, and maybe with the acceptance of large areas of the country.

My first formula would be to maintain the present work-relief load until about April 1. This will be the period when the grass is again turning green and becoming fit for grazing. Under this formula, which may be termed "the grazing method," the country could be zoned off, with the first reduction made in those favored areas where the grass begins to green and the leaves to bud and the flowers to bloom and the birds to sing very early in the spring.

It could begin in the luscious valleys of the East and South; Kentucky, the Bluegrass State, where the grazing is always good; the level green stretches of Illinois and Indiana; the beautiful rolling hills of Ohio and Pennsylvania, all of which area in the early springtime becomes a verdant carpet which must gladden the eye of Heaven. Perhaps as we go farther south we might begin turning them out to grass about St. Patrick's Day. As we go west where the spring season is later, we could provide in the bill a corresponding retardation of the process.

To be perfectly candid with Members, I have in mind my home State out in the Rockies where the grazing is not so good until along in June. It is not springtime in the Rockies until June. It would be a sectional discrimination against those people to put them out to grass at the same time they could go out in the more favored regions of the lowlands. If the grazing formula is decided upon, the country could be conveniently zoned off, and since work-relief appropriations are hereafter to be earmarked and a bill of particulars included in the act, the grazing system of relief could be readily worked into it.

Another formula which appeals to me is to inaugurate the drying-up program by first turning relief back to the States and districts that went Republican last November. The result in those States and districts could indeed be considered as a mandate to Congress to turn their share of the submerged one-third over to them. They must have understood that such was the program of the Republican Party in Congress the last 2 years. In my district it was put up to them in so many words, that relief was the proper burden of the States and counties and should be assumed by them. The voters rejected the proposition.

This formula would require only a simple amendment, excluding the States and districts that went Republican in 1938 from having to accept work-relief appropriations. As a precaution against any possibility of mistake as to the mandate, I would make acceptance of the exclusion optional with the States and districts involved. I feel quite confident that none of them would take the money, but for fear any of them may come forward with a claim that they did not know it was "loaded" when they voted Republican last fall, I would include them in the appropriation and leave them the choice. It would be a noble experiment and the result might shed some light upon the growing controversial issue of work relief.

A third formula would relate to the southern section of the country, where there has been great and growing opposition in Congress to the work-relief program. It may not be known to all the Members that in that favored area Mr. Hopkins, who is charged with very expansive ideas about caring for the unemployed, set wage schedules as high as \$19 to \$21 a month. This munificence appears to have been wholly gratuitous, and had, besides, the effect of seriously disturbing the wage structure in that section of the country.

According to some views I have heard expressed here on the floor, it appears that nobody down there who could get as much as \$19 to \$21 a month on W. P. A. wanted a job at the prevailing wage in private employment. That was more money than they had ever seen or would know what to do with. While nature is not so prodigal there as in the Tropics, the favored people of that area can come much nearer to living off of nature than in the less friendly northern and western areas of the country. It is always springtime in the sunny South. I love to drive around that way to Washington and get the cold soaked out of my bones and absorb the inviting landscape, where every prospect pleases and which has produced the only real chivalry on American soil, and I mean that.

I think it would be a noble gesture were the Representatives from that most-favored area, perhaps under the leadership of Virginia, which has assumed the leading role at both ends of the Capitol in the campaign for drastic economy in Federal work relief, to propose an amendment excluding those States en bloc from the demoralizing effects of a program which they consider is not only costing the taxpayers too much money but is sapping the very vitals of the manhood of America. I can assure them in advance of my support of the motion and what little missionary work I may be able to accomplish in that behalf.

While these formulas I have suggested perhaps by no means exhaust the ways out of our dilemma, I would not care to clutter up the RECORD with a confusion of suggestions. No doubt under the inspiration of the suggestions I have made, the minds of other Members will get busy and devise other practical formulas, the sum total of which, embodied in a bill, may completely solve the burdensome work-relief problem, and without cost to anybody. The Federal Government would be rid of the great cost and the States would have nothing to pay it with. They can go back to Mr. Hoover's formula of selling red apples on the corner and hitting the Red Cross and Community Chest for a hand out.

In order, however, that my position may be perfectly clear, I give warning now that in the absence of the adoption of some or all of these formulas, I propose to vote for the sum of \$875,000,000. The President and the Administrator have both stated this sum to be necessary; theirs is the responsibility, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], a member of the committee, has just stated that there is absolutely nothing in the hearings upon which to base the cut of \$150,000,000 made by the Appropriations Committee or any sum less than \$875,000,000. [Applause.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reference has been made here today to communism in certain of the W. P. A. projects, particularly the Federal writers project and the Federal theater project. Reference has also been made to the report made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

I should like to call the attention of the members of the Committee not only to the report but to the matter on this subject contained in the volumes of testimony, two of which I have here. In each one of these volumes are about a thousand pages. There will be 4,000 pages in all of testimony recently presented to the Dies Committee. Much in these volumes has to do with un-American activities on Federal Government projects. A large part of the testimony has to do with communism in the Federal theater project and in the Federal writers project.

Regardless of who reads these volumes, and I certainly hope every Member of the House will read them, one cannot get away from the thought that these Federal writers projects and the Federal theater projects in certain of our large cities, notably New York, are honeycombed with communism. Testimony was given the committee by one witness after another that Communist literature was given out on the projects, on project time, and that Communist meetings were held during the time workers were supposed to be engaged in their regular activities. One witness testified that 80 percent of the members on the Federal writers project in New York City were either members of the Communist Party or friendly to the Communist cause.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Did the gentleman or his committee investigate the Workers' Alliance?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Yes; we did.

Mr. FISH. Is that a Communist organization?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Testimony was presented to the committee not by one witness but by many witnesses

that the Workers' Alliance is nothing more than a front organization for the Communist Party.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman know that Mr. Aubrey Williams, formerly Deputy Administrator of the Works Progress Administration, said to that group, "We have got to stick together, we have got to keep our friends in power"?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Not only do I know that, but those exact words were presented to the committee as testimony.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I cannot yield further. I have only 10 minutes. If I can get more time, I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

One of the worst things about the Federal theater project in New York City is the plays put on by that project, plays of a very radical nature, advocating, among other things, a change in our form of government—plays that have been protested to the National Director of Federal theater project by not only patriotic organizations and veterans' organizations but leading police officials in the particular municipalities where these plays were staged.

Let me read from this testimony a statement by Byrnes MacDonald, sixth deputy police commissioner of the city of New York. This statement is contained in a letter written by him to Mrs. Hallie Flanagan, National Director of the Federal Theater Project, and has to do with a play called *Revolt of the Beavers*, a fairy tale, put on for the benefit of the youth of the Nation. This is what Byrnes MacDonald, sixth deputy police commissioner of New York City, had to say about that play, and while I shall not now read the entire letter, I shall ask permission to place the whole letter in the *RECORD*:

I know of no better way to conclude than to quote Mr. Atkinson's criticism of the play.

Mr. Atkinson is one of the leading dramatic critics of the New York Times. Mr. Atkinson said this:

The style is playful; the mood is gravely gay and simple-minded. Many children now unschooled in the technique of revolution now have an opportunity, at Government expense, to improve their tender minds. Mother Goose is no longer a rhymed escapist. She has been studying Marx; Jack and Jill lead the class revolution.

This is the kind of play the Federal theater project, at the taxpayers' expense, is putting on for the benefit of the youth of this Nation.

While mentioning plays, I wish to quote some testimony with respect to another play, a play we have all heard about, called *Triple A Plowed Under*. The witness in testimony before the Dies committee said:

That was one play which on the opening night required 30 New York policemen to guard the play and prevent a riot.

It contained a scene in which the secretary of the Communist Party condemns the judiciary of the United States Government. Such characters as George Washington and Andrew Jackson were removed from the play in order to give a prominent part to the secretary of the Communist Party, Earl Browder. The conclusion of the play is the establishment of a political party in accordance with the wish expressed by the secretary of the Communist Party, expressed by Mr. Earl Browder himself in a radio broadcast a short time previous to the production.

Other plays, like *Created Equal*, *Injunction Granted*, and *Power*, are all definitely propaganda plays. Not only that, but many of these Federal theater project plays are just as communistic as any play put on by the National Theater in the Soviet Union.

I want to say a word about another one of the W. P. A. arts projects, particularly the one in New York City, and that is the writers' project. A witness who came before the Dies committee stated that of the 15 supervisors on the writers' project in New York City, 13 were members of the Communist Party, and that of all the employees on that project, 80 percent of them were members of the Workers' Alliance and that you could not get on the project today unless you became a members of the Workers' Alliance; and it did not make any difference whether you were a veteran or how worthy you were or in what sort of straitened cir-

cumstances you were, you just could not get on the writers' project in New York City today unless you joined the Workers' Alliance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. This witness also said that of the 500 workers, so-called, on that project they had published in 3½ years, 5 books. Five hundred workers published 5 books and 2 of the 5 were gotten out since the Dies committee started its meetings, and of the 500 workers 1 man was responsible for 3 of the books and the 499 other workers were responsible for 2. The reason for this was the inefficiency of the project, the constant bickering, the constant communistic meetings, the constant protest meetings, and it was not until the Dies committee, which has been investigating un-American activities, started that the administrators of the project were able to make anything at all out of the chaos that had existed.

I may say one more thing about these projects, and this has reference to a statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], whose suggestion I believe it was to have an investigation of the W. P. A. If such an investigation is held, I hope the investigators will develop some testimony that was brought out in the Dies committee meetings by one of the witnesses, Mr. Revzin, who was asked this question:

Are you prepared to testify at a later date, before any other committee which may be appointed, a committee other than this particular one, as to the inefficiency, extravagance, and corruption in connection with the Federal theater project in New York City?

Mr. Revzin, who was an employee of the Federal theater project, answered, "Yes, sir."

Contrast this evidence of extravagance, corruption, and, as I have earlier pointed out, the existence of communism and other forms of radicalism on many of the Works Progress Administration projects with the unfortunate situation existing in New Jersey and perhaps most of the other States in the Union, whereby poor unfortunate people over 65 years of age are denied any assistance from the Works Progress Administration. In the month of November of 1938 the Works Progress Administration in New Jersey issued an order that all people over 65 years of age and all other people who might be eligible under the Federal law for social security benefits, including, of course, widows who have minor children, should be denied further assistance from the W. P. A. In New Jersey it means that instead of a family receiving in the neighborhood of \$60 a month, the W. P. A. wage, to live on, it must from now on be satisfied with something in the neighborhood of \$25 a month. Imagine—a whole family in many cases being forced to subsist on a bare pittance of \$25 a month.

This, to me, is brutal, cruel, and disgraceful, especially so when we take into consideration these poor people had their W. P. A. benefits taken away from them almost without notice.

I hope that instead of appropriating millions of dollars to care for many of the un-American activities on the Federal theater project and the Federal writers' project, and instead of appropriating millions of dollars with which to carry on the political activities of the W. P. A., we will divert these millions to the care of our worthy older people and to our worthy unemployed widows with minor children, who have been so abruptly thrown out in the cold.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I doubt, after all, whether a discussion limited to the question of whether or not we shall or shall not vote money for relief is the important issue here today. Relief money in some adequate amount must be appropriated. To my mind it is clear that we should on this occasion, however, reexamine the affairs of government to the end that we determine, if we can, why, after

6 years of governmental administration under the New Deal, we still find it necessary to come here in the Congress of the United States and appropriate ever-increasing millions to take care of millions yet unemployed.

We are all for the relief that is necessary to be granted to the people who are out of employment. This almost goes without saying, but there are some of us who are very much interested in determining just what the future will be and just what we may expect. Personally, I have never quarreled with the W. P. A. as such. I have always said that if my Government and my society could not offer me anything better than a Government job under W. P. A. I would take it, but I would do so looking to the dawning of a brighter day when I could again go back into real industry and legitimate employment and make the wages and salary that only that kind of industry or business can pay.

Now, to go back a little, we had an election in 1932. The people of this country held the Government then in power responsible for the economic condition of the country and there were certain things said in that campaign. I realize lots of people do not like to have them referred to, but do you recall that in the course of that campaign it was said that excessive governmental spending is a brake on any return to normal business activity, and again it was said, "I consider reduction in Federal spending as the greatest contribution that government can make to business." It was recognized then that the problem before the country was to find jobs for the people who wanted to work, and on that platform and on such promises a new government came into power. They had not been in power 30 days until those promises were kicked out of the White House window and the Government was embarked, not on a policy of Government economy to provide jobs, as had been promised, but on a policy of spending to promote recovery. In my opinion, the statements made in the 1932 campaign were statements of fact. The tragedy is that they were not followed in practice.

I have always held and still hold that excessive Government spending is a brake on any return to normal business activity.

In determining the amount of money that should at this time be made available for relief, I do not have the confidence in the estimates sent down here that I would have if the people directly in charge of the Government and its program would cut loose from this foolish idea that we can spend ourselves prosperous. They should in all sincerity say to us, "We want this money to take care of relief, and we are no longer trying to prime the pump." We tried pump priming for 6 years, and it has not done the job. Witness the accomplishments. I say if you measure the New Deal on the basis of accomplishment, it has been an utter and dismal failure. It has not given jobs to the people out of employment. It has not given good prices to the farmers. And it is not a satisfactory answer to continually hark back to 1932.

We came along to 1936. We had an election that year. The new dealers stuck out their chests and said, "We are better off, and we planned it that way," and the people of the country apparently believed them and voted that way. Then following that election, the people in charge of our Government thought that they had some sort of a mandate from the people of America to make the country over. So we started early in January in 1937 to make the country over.

The people in charge of the New Deal failed to recognize that the emergency was over, that the country was beginning to get well naturally and normally, that jobs were being provided for people by the efforts of the people themselves. I say the vital error was made when the people in charge of our Government failed to recognize that the emergency was over. Disregarding the real interests of the country, they went ahead joyfully on this scheme to make the country over, to pack the Court, to destroy the balance of constitutional government. We argued and fought around here all through the 1937 first session. Then we were called back in

special session. The country had hit the toboggan. We dropped faster into this Roosevelt depression than we have into any other depression. And were we called back here to do anything to stem the tide of an on-rushing depression? Oh, no; we were called back here to pass a reorganization bill that nobody seemed to want, to establish seven little T. V. A.'s over the country, and to do a lot more things calculated to increase and heighten the depression. You can find in that the reason for the fact that we are here today, not to go on to a sound and permanent recovery but to find, after years of attempted pump priming, that the new dealers have nothing better to offer the people of our land, the unemployed, than subsistence jobs on made-work projects. On November 8 of last year the people rightfully held the Government responsible for economic depression.

In my opinion we are in an intolerable situation. We cannot go on in this country with half of our working people on the Government pay rolls and projects at starvation wages, and then have the other half of the people on the rolls of industry and agriculture drawing the wages that only that kind of industry and agriculture can pay. We have to go one way, or we have to go the other way.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I think the gentleman from Indiana probably has overlooked one accomplishment of the present administration and that is that as a result of the policies of the administration the poor of this country have been fixed or frozen in their unfortunate position.

Mr. GIFFORD. And, Mr. Chairman, on this matter of spending ourselves into prosperity, has the gentleman ever heard about the advice of drinking yourself sober?

Mr. HALLECK. I have been told that that is poor advice. [Laughter.] No, Mr. Chairman, the answer does not lie in the direction of more Federal spending to promote recovery. Real and permanent recovery will come from the finding of real jobs, and as one way of getting started in that direction, why not use some economy in the spending of relief money.

There has been a lot of talk about relief in politics. Do you know the people who squawked the loudest about politics in relief? I heard plenty of real Democrats in the Congress, on whom the wrath of the New Deal was turned in the primaries, and I heard those people cry out louder and longer about politics in relief than any Republican. I heard Members of this House who were seeking to be nominated to the Senate of the United States come back to the House, to the cloak rooms and to the floor, and say that in their States white collar W. P. A. supervisors had been put on the pay rolls for no other purpose than to electioneer against them and to bring about the nomination of the persons favored by the New Deal.

The only permanent and lasting solution of this problem of relief is to find more work opportunities for the people who want to work.

I have no sympathy or patience with those people who say that we cannot put the people of America back to work. If you will look in the poorer homes of your own districts you will see there a consumer demand, crying to be filled, sufficient to keep every factory going night and day for years before it can be filled. Then why say with Mr. Hopkins, "We are perpetually to have an army of millions of unemployed people with no job other than W. P. A."? I hold for our unemployed better promise in the future of this land. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the membership of this body is desirous of approaching this matter of providing for the unemployed of this country, in a non-partisan, nonpolitical, and nonsectional spirit. My Republican colleagues from Massachusetts did not campaign last fall on a platform pledging indiscriminate slashing of

W. P. A. appropriations. On the contrary, many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle campaigned on very liberal platforms during the last election. In many instances they held out promises to their constituents that if elected they would lend their support to appropriations sufficient to provide for the needy unemployed.

It seems to me that this whole question resolves itself into the issue of whether we are going to make adequate provision for the unemployed on the scientific basis of known factual information submitted by Colonel Harrington, Administrator of the W. P. A., and contained in the hearings, or whether you are going to submit to the arbitrary slash recommended by the committee without regard for the actual needs demonstrated by the report of the hearings.

I heard the very able argument of the chairman of the subcommittee this morning, a man for whom I have the greatest admiration. I heard him make the very optimistic statement, which is borne out also by Colonel Harrington, that it is estimated that some 1,500,000 persons will be absorbed by private employment within the next few months. We all hope that is so and hope that the number will really exceed the estimate.

But I call to the attention of the able chairman of this committee the statement contained in Colonel Harrington's testimony on page 35 of the hearings, that he made allowance for this prospect in arriving at his estimate of \$875,000,000 as necessary requirements until July 1. I call attention also to the statement of Colonel Harrington in reply to a member of the committee which is contained in the hearings on page 101 that there are 750,000 persons already certified as eligible for W. P. A. employment, who have been unable to get on the rolls of the Works Progress Administration. Therefore, these 750,000 persons who have full W. P. A. eligibility must be considered in addition to the more than 3,000,000 persons already on W. P. A. rolls in calculating the full needs of W. P. A.

The problem we must face is one that cannot wait. As I understand it, within a few weeks all of the funds that were made available for this agency during the last session of Congress will be exhausted. One week's unemployment to a family of persons depending upon W. P. A. employment in my district means suffering; means privation; means that they go without food and fuel, and possible eviction for failure to pay rent. It is their immediate and pressing concern. They cannot wait for prolonged congressional investigations. I do not believe that there are persons in this body who will be persuaded by political reasons to forget the needs of the unemployed. I believe most of us are of the opinion that adequate provision should be made to prevent serious suffering and privation in this country.

Now, I refer to the statement beginning on page 149 of the hearings made by Mayor LaGuardia, who appeared before the committee, not only representing the great metropolis of New York City but also as the delegated representative of the United States Conference of Mayors, composed of mayors of cities of over 50,000 population. The factual reports from major cities of the United States with reference to W. P. A. needs are incorporated in his statement. He states that the mayors are absolutely unanimous in the opinion that even the \$875,000,000 requested by W. P. A. authorities is insufficient to take care of the needs of the unemployed of this country. They estimate that \$915,000,000 will be required. Who are more conversant with this situation than the mayors of our country, the men who, day in and day out in their several communities, are confronted with the relief problem? Now, if we are going to assume the obligation of providing employment for the unemployed employables of this country, and not throw the burden upon the States and their subdivisions, it seems to me that we should vote for the sum of \$875,000,000 recommended by the W. P. A. authorities as being the least amount sufficient to provide for the requirements of this agency for the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. I am sorry, I have not time to yield.

From this same source we have the statement that if the appropriation is cut to \$725,000,000, as recommended by the committee, one-third of the present rolls, or 1,151,000, will lose their jobs on the W. P. A. It is estimated that if only \$725,000,000 is appropriated the cuts in W. P. A. rolls in some of the States will run as follows: In Pennsylvania, 97,000; in Ohio, 97,600; in Texas, 42,000; in New Jersey, 38,500.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. In Missouri, 40,800; in Michigan, 54,400; Illinois, 90,000; California, 44,000; Massachusetts, 47,800; Wisconsin, 29,500; while in the city of New York alone 66,700 will have to be taken from the rolls; and in the city of Chicago 43,500.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, admitted in his remarks that some 500,000 persons admittedly eligible for this relief will have to be taken from the rolls of the W. P. A. if we adopt the resolution presented by the committee appropriating \$725,000,000. Which 500,000 are you going to drop? Where are you going to start cutting? How can this be accomplished without immediate hardship? The figures submitted by Colonel Harrington have not been disputed. His testimony remains uncontroverted up to the present time. These unemployed people are depending upon Congress to provide some means of sustenance for themselves and their families.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that we shall be actuated in dealing with this matter only by the sincere desire to provide for the needy unemployed without partisan or political bias. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, if you really have disposition to cut appropriations for relief at this time, I suggest that this is not the time to do it, not in the winter months. I come from the center of the Dust Bowl, where 80 percent of all the farmers in my county are on relief. Some of these families are now receiving \$10 to \$15 a month per family, and it is impossible to properly heat a building in that section of the country during the winter months for less than \$8 per month.

If you are going to cut relief below the plan suggested by the President, you surely do not want to do it at this time, because if you do you will have another 1,000 farmers on the highway as you have in Missouri today, driven out because the owners of the land do not want to divide the payments received from the Government—chase them out and hire men by the day so they can keep all the checks. In my State mortgage foreclosures are proceeding more rapidly now than ever. What are you going to do with this great body of people who through no fault of their own find themselves out on the highways in the winter months? Are you going to sit here and say you will cut the appropriations?

We have to pay for our independence in this body. I have had to pay for my independence. I have not served on committees in this House, and I do not presume I shall, because I have some independence; but there is no organization in this House which can take that independence away. Do your worst with your committees, so far as I am concerned, but I am not going to give up the theories I believe are right; and whenever the President of the United States is right I am willing to subscribe to it. He is right in the amount that he asks for in this appropriation bill.

If you want to regulate relief so there will be no politics in it—there is not very much politics in relief in my State because both Senators and both Congressmen belong to the Republican Party and relief has been in the hands of the

Democrats. They have handled it all right in our State, but if you believe that there should be no politics in the organization at all, why do you not distribute these funds to the States, send the money to the States and let them handle it? [Applause.] Congress can do this. I have advocated this plan of relief distribution ever since I have been in Congress.

For God's sake, do not get so fast about doing this job that you forget to lay down the regulations yourselves and not leave that to some bureau. It is not the fault of the bureau; it is the fault of us who sit here and could do the job ourselves if we would. Can we not write a set of rules under which relief shall be distributed? It is our plain duty to give these directions; but having failed to do it, we should not be heard to complain of the rules laid down by a bureau.

As long as private business cannot employ these people, who can object to the Government's employment program?

The gentleman from Virginia, for whom I have a great deal of admiration, said that we shall have to borrow every dollar of the money we appropriate for this purpose. I have never heard such a doctrine in all my life, but I am convinced that he is speaking the sentiments of this House. I do not believe this House has nerve enough to write into this bill, or any other bill, the direction that we shall issue money, Treasury notes that do not draw interest, to pay for the relief administration—I do not believe you have—but some day that will be done right here in this body. What a crime to permit anyone to reap a harvest of interest off of relief money!

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I have over 188,000,000,000 of German marks, printing press marks. I will give them to you if you want to pass them around, since you are advocating that kind of money in America.

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; and that is just exactly like our money will be when this Government goes down as the German Government did. When that happens neither currency or bonds will have any value.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. And we are pretty close to it now. These 188,000,000,000 German marks would not buy a schnitz of German beer in Germany during the inflation.

Mr. BURDICK. You, of course, know that when any government fails, its money always becomes worthless.

The gentleman from Virginia also said that P. W. A. will take up the slack. Replying to that, I would point out that P. W. A. operations require the matching of Federal funds with State funds. In my section of the country we have not had a paying crop for 9 years. Consequently, the P. W. A. does not apply to our situation. I say to you that if you do not want thousands of farmers and workers along the highways of this Nation headed for the Capitol at Washington, you had better get busy and appropriate money to give them the bare necessities of life.

Remember that the strongest law recognized by the whole human race is the law of self-preservation. If we deny our citizens the right to live, when the situation is due to nothing they have done, can we expect them to peacefully fold their arms and expire? No, Mr. Chairman; they will not—they are Americans. Many in want today have fought for their country; they are in want, their children are in want, and they will sustain themselves by violent action if necessary. This House fails to understand how critical the situation is with millions of our citizens. You do not want communism, neither do I; but if you persist in your intention to cut people off of the food that sustains life, you will make more Communists in America than all the organizers of communism in this country. Remember that communism is a symptom of a diseased government. Communism has never grown or developed in any country where the government guarantees

to its people the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Let people live, let them work, let them take care of their families under the American standard of living, and you can dismiss the danger of communism.

We all recognize that every man and every woman in this country has a right to live. Does anybody dispute that? If through no fault of their own they are unable to take care of themselves, what is the duty of this Government? I would like to have somebody answer this question.

Just merely because the President of the United States suggests this money is no reason in the world why I should vote against it. This time the President is right. Maybe something will come up here in the House, and we will think the President is not right. I will be just as free to vote against him then as I am free to vote with him on this proposition. To inject any political consequences into a question of this kind, when we have millions out of jobs, millions hungry and cold, and we sitting here where we are warm and refusing to appropriate that money, is more than I believe this Congress will ever do. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, any observer who has listened to the debate today has concluded that there has been more politics played here today with relief, and particularly with the unemployed who are dependent on W. P. A., than at anytime or anywhere else in the country. The reactionary forces in this House have devoted a great portion of the debate, not to the needs of the unemployed, not to the welfare of our country, but to petty politics, to political sniping, to an attempt to discredit the unemployed and their organization and have raised a huge smoke screen to hide the real issue; that is, the gross inadequacy of the \$725,000,000 suggested by the Appropriations Committee in the resolution under consideration.

It seems to me the proposition which we have before us is a proposition which deals with the welfare of our country; it deals with the welfare of the unemployed of our country; and whether you be Republicans or Democrats, no matter to what party you may belong, there is one fundamental principle which we cannot fail to recognize and that is that the civilization of the American people is dependent on the welfare of the unemployed millions of Americans. Tear down and destroy the welfare of the unemployed in America and you are aiming a most serious blow to the fundamental American institutions which we all revere.

Let us get down and analyze the effect of the reduced appropriations recommended. It is admitted on page 4 of the committee's report that 300,000 W. P. A. workers will be laid off if the President's request of \$875,000,000 were granted. The committee aggravates this situation by recommending only \$725,000,000. Let us see. How many workers on W. P. A. are going to be dismissed by cutting the appropriation to \$725,000,000? The committee report estimates about a million will be fired as a result of their reduced appropriation. I am not ready to agree with this report except for the purpose of argument and debate. I prefer to accept the report of the United States Conference of Mayors, which I believe is much more scientific and less speculative than the report submitted by the committee. The report submitted by the United States Conference of Mayors is based on the fact there are, as of January 1, 1939, 3,080,300 workers on W. P. A. If the reduced amount of \$725,000,000 reported by the committee is not substantially raised, the number of W. P. A. workers will be reduced to 1,930,000 by June 30. This means an actual lay-off of 1,151,300 needy W. P. A. workers who are now employed on the useful W. P. A. projects throughout the United States.

You reactionaries today make unjustified and unwarranted attacks on the Workers' Alliance; you raise the smoke screen of relief in politics; you raise the issue of

maladministration, but why do you not tell what you propose to do with 1,151,300 workers whom you deprive of even the means of a bare existence? That is the real issue before you in this Committee. That is the proposition, and I challenge you to answer it. Are you ready in private industry to absorb the 1,151,300 W. P. A. workers who are going to be removed from the W. P. A. rolls as a result of this cut? How about the additional 500,000 certified for W. P. A. and not put on?

Mr. Chairman, we have a great deal of hope and optimism, but when you say that private industry is going to absorb them, I think it is a great deal of wishful thinking. We all agree there is an upturn in business, but the best way to destroy this improvement is by cutting W. P. A. appropriations. Any retrenchment of W. P. A. spending at this time or any cutting of public spending which gives the public purchasing power is bound to bring about a reverse in this upturn in business.

We need not speculate. Let us rely on experience. Let us see what has happened in the recent past when we cut W. P. A. at a time when business was improving.

The following is what we spent monthly on W. P. A. for the year 1936:

January	\$168,000,000
February	164,000,000
March	192,000,000
April	183,000,000
May	174,000,000
June	169,000,000
July	163,000,000
August	157,000,000
September	165,000,000
October	181,000,000
November	168,000,000
December	185,000,000

Total..... 2,069,000,000

At the beginning of 1937, with signs of improvement all over the country and business conditions in general, with a rise in sales and production, we cut W. P. A., and we spent as follows:

January	\$148,000,000
February	134,000,000
March	166,000,000
April	144,000,000
May	138,000,000
June	148,000,000
July	116,000,000
August	102,000,000
September	100,000,000
October	100,000,000
November	100,000,000
December	112,000,000

Total..... 1,509,000,000

In 1938, realizing our mistake and in the midst of the recession, we commenced to increase our W. P. A. monthly expenditures as follows:

January	\$107,000,000
February	109,000,000
March	152,000,000
April	147,000,000
May	158,000,000
June	175,000,000

You will note, therefore, that the first big cut came at the beginning of 1937. The second cut came in July of the same year.

The average monthly expenditure, adjusted for seasonal variations in 1936, was \$172,000,000. The average monthly expenditure, adjusted for seasonal variations, the first half of 1937 was \$146,000,000. The average monthly expenditure, adjusted for seasonal variations, the second half of 1937 was \$105,000,000. So, at the very beginning of 1937, which marked the beginning of the recession, collection of taxes for old-age benefits began, and this withdrew another \$500,000,000 for the year out of consumption. Business withstood the shock of this combined drain on consumption for several months, largely by piling up inventories, also because of foreign rearmament demands, and because reduction in consumer buying power does not make itself felt immediately on orders received by producers.

Let us see what happened during the corresponding period on production. The Federal Reserve index of production for 1937 shows as follows:

January	114
February	116
March	118
April	118
May	118
June	114
July	114
August	117
September	111
October	102
November	88
December	84

Department-store figures followed the same general course as production:

January 1936	81
January 1937	93
April 1937	93
July	94
October	93
November	91
December	89

The Department of Commerce Survey of Current Business of March 1938 showed also a sharp decline in index of incomes of 100 in 1929 down to 55 in 1933, up to 89 in 1937, and from there on went into a nosedive until W. P. A. expenditures were increased.

We find the following happened to industrial production in 1938:

January	80
February	79
March	79
April	77
May	76
June	77
July	83
August	88
September	91

This rise in production followed along with the rise in W. P. A. spending. Consequently experience has taught us that by cutting down W. P. A. appropriations we necessarily cut down W. P. A. spending, and in so doing we are cutting down the purchasing power of the American people. The moment we cut down the purchasing power of the American people, particularly at a time when there is any sign of business recovery, that business upturn goes immediately into a downward spin.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this experience should teach us that any cut in W. P. A. will not help business; it will not continue recovery; it will not help private industry; but, to the contrary, private industry will be hurt, recovery set back, and business will be dealt a staggering blow. Hence, instead of absorbing the discharged W. P. A. workers, more American wage earners and salaried workers will be thrown out of private industry. The removal of W. P. A. workers from W. P. A. must be a natural process. W. P. A. workers want jobs in private industry. As conditions improve, these workers will go into private industry as private industry offers jobs. This is the only process which will reduce the number on W. P. A.; improve business and cut down unemployment. Precipitous cuts mean only less jobs in private industry. Any cut in W. P. A. appropriations at this time is going to bring about another terrific recession in this country. I know the reactionaries in this country want a recession, because a recession is the best guaranty of electing reactionaries to public office and electing a reactionary to the White House. A recession at this time or within the next few months is the best guaranty of bringing about reactionary administrations throughout the country; and I say to the Members of this House who believe themselves to be liberal, who believe themselves to be progressive, that the best guaranty against the election of reactionaries to office is to keep up this business upturn, and the best guaranty toward keeping up that business improvement, as taught us through experience, is to keep up W. P. A. appropriations in order to take care of the needs of the unemployed and at the same time protect the purchasing power of the American people which is so necessary and so vital to maintain a sus-

tained improvement in business conditions in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks the statement released by the United States Conference of Mayors.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SOUTH). The gentleman will have to get that permission in the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Very well; I shall do that.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
WASHINGTON, D. C., January 11, 1939.

TOTAL OF 1,151,300 W. P. A. WORKERS TO LOSE JOBS BY JUNE 30 UNDER
HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE AMOUNT OF SEVEN HUNDRED
AND TWENTY-FIVE MILLIONS

One million one hundred and fifty-one thousand three hundred needy W. P. A. workers must be discharged from their jobs by June 30 if the action of the House Appropriations Subcommittee in recommending a W. P. A. deficiency appropriation of only 725 millions is sustained by the Congress.

W. P. A. employment on January 1, 1939, totaled 3,081,300 workers. Under the reduced amount of 725 millions reported by the subcommittee, employment will have to go down to 1,930,000 by June 30.

This involves the discharge of 1,151,300 W. P. A. workers. The figures for each State, tabulated by the United States Conference of Mayors for the first time since action by the House Appropriations Subcommittee, are attached herewith. They range from a reduction of 1,000 W. P. A. workers in Nevada to a reduction of 97,700 in Pennsylvania and 97,600 in Ohio. Texas must discharge 42,000 W. P. A. workers, New Jersey 38,500 workers, Missouri 40,800 workers, Michigan 54,400 workers, Illinois 90,000 workers, California 44,300 workers, Massachusetts 47,800 workers, Wisconsin 29,500 workers, Oklahoma 26,000 workers, and Virginia 11,800 workers.

A second tabulation from 24 major cities shows that reductions of over 33 percent of present W. P. A. employment quotas will be necessary by June 30. These figures show a range in the necessity for discharge of 1,800 W. P. A. workers in Baltimore by June 30 up to 43,500 in Chicago, 21,400 in Detroit, 66,700 in New York City, 13,200 in Los Angeles, 27,200 in Cleveland, 11,200 in Boston, 9,700 in Milwaukee, 12,600 in St. Louis, and 8,900 in Philadelphia.

The figures tabulated are based upon a gradual reduction beginning February in accordance with the limited amount recommended, namely, \$725,000,000. If, however, the W. P. A. maintains its present quota of 3,000,000 workers during the months of February and March it will then be necessary to get down to a quota of 1,375,000 workers by June 30. This would mean that, between April 1 and June 30, 1,625,000 needy W. P. A. workers would have to be discharged.

The figures are as follows:

Employment schedule with deficiency appropriation of \$725,000,000
to the Works Progress Administration

	Employment	Cost at \$61 per worker
		Millions
February.....	3,000,000	183.0
March.....	3,000,000	183.0
April.....	2,500,000	152.5
May.....	2,000,000	122.0
June.....	1,375,000	83.9
Average.....	2,375,000	724.4

These facts are made available at this time in order that all concerned—the Federal Government, the States, and the cities—will know the exact situation which will exist under a deficiency W. P. A. appropriation of seven hundred and twenty-five millions.

PAUL V. BETTERS,
Executive Director.

[Enclosures]

Estimated W. P. A. employment in June 1939 under deficiency
appropriation of \$725,000,000¹

(Assuming that relative distribution of need in the several States continues on present basis and that arbitrary discharge of workers begins immediately without regard to seasonal increases in need during winter months)

State	Employment, Dec. 31, 1938	Estimated employment, June 1939	Reduction from Dec. 31
		Number	
Grand total.....	3,081,300	1,930,000	1,151,300
Alabama.....	61,500	38,500	23,000
Arizona.....	11,400	7,100	4,300
Arkansas.....	49,900	31,300	18,600
California.....	118,500	74,200	44,300
Colorado.....	31,800	19,900	11,900

¹ Includes employment on projects financed by transfer of Works Progress Administration funds.

Estimated W. P. A. employment in June 1939 under deficiency
appropriation of \$725,000,000—Continued

State	Employment, Dec. 31, 1938	Estimated employment, June 1939	Reduction from Dec. 31
		Number	
Connecticut.....	28,900	18,100	10,800
Delaware.....	4,000	2,500	1,500
District of Columbia.....	13,800	8,600	5,200
Florida.....	52,400	32,800	19,600
Georgia.....	63,500	39,800	23,700
Idaho.....	11,100	7,000	4,100
Illinois.....	241,000	151,000	90,000
Indiana.....	85,800	53,800	32,000
Iowa.....	31,500	19,700	11,800
Kansas.....	36,900	23,100	13,800
Kentucky.....	67,000	42,000	25,000
Louisiana.....	53,100	33,300	19,800
Maine.....	10,900	6,800	4,100
Maryland.....	19,500	12,200	7,300
Massachusetts.....	127,900	80,100	47,800
Michigan.....	145,500	91,100	54,400
Minnesota.....	66,500	41,700	24,800
Mississippi.....	48,500	30,400	18,100
Missouri.....	109,100	68,300	40,800
Montana.....	20,600	12,900	7,700
Nebraska.....	27,800	17,400	10,400
Nevada.....	2,600	1,600	1,000
New Hampshire.....	11,200	7,000	4,200
New Jersey.....	103,000	64,500	38,500
New Mexico.....	11,800	7,400	4,400
New York City.....	179,600	112,500	67,100
New York (exclusive of New York City).....	66,000	41,400	24,600
North Carolina.....	53,900	33,800	20,100
North Dakota.....	15,100	9,500	5,600
Ohio.....	261,200	163,600	97,600
Oklahoma.....	69,500	43,500	26,000
Oregon.....	19,300	12,100	7,200
Pennsylvania.....	201,500	163,800	97,700
Rhode Island.....	16,400	10,300	6,100
South Carolina.....	43,600	27,300	16,300
South Dakota.....	16,000	10,000	6,000
Tennessee.....	53,500	33,500	20,000
Texas.....	112,300	70,300	42,000
Utah.....	14,900	9,300	5,600
Vermont.....	8,200	5,100	3,100
Virginia.....	31,600	19,800	11,800
Washington.....	53,300	33,400	19,900
West Virginia.....	50,200	31,500	18,700
Wisconsin.....	78,900	49,400	29,500
Wyoming.....	4,800	3,000	1,800
Hawaii.....	3,100	1,900	1,200
Virgin Islands.....	1,400	900	500

Estimated Works Progress Administration employment in June 1939
in selected cities under deficiency appropriation of \$725,000,000

[Assuming that relative distribution of need continues on present basis and that arbitrary discharge of workers begins immediately without regard to seasonal increases in need during winter months]

City	Employment, Dec. 24, 1938	Estimated employment, June 1939	Reduction from Dec. 24
		Number	
Akron, Ohio.....	18,400	11,500	6,900
Atlanta, Ga.....	14,700	9,200	5,500
Baltimore, Md.....	4,900	3,100	1,800
Birmingham, Ala.....	13,600	8,500	5,100
Boston, Mass.....	29,900	18,700	11,200
Buffalo, N. Y.....	10,200	6,400	3,800
Chicago, Ill.....	116,400	72,900	43,500
Cleveland, Ohio.....	72,800	45,600	27,200
Dallas, Tex.....	6,300	3,900	2,400
Detroit, Mich.....	67,300	35,900	21,400
District of Columbia.....	12,600	7,900	4,700
Flint, Mich.....	5,400	3,400	2,000
Kansas City, Mo.....	16,000	10,000	6,000
Los Angeles, Calif.....	35,400	22,200	13,200
Milwaukee, Wis.....	26,000	16,300	9,700
Minneapolis, Minn.....	15,900	10,000	5,900
Newark, N. J.....	17,400	10,900	6,500
New Orleans, La.....	21,800	13,700	8,100
New York City, N. Y.....	178,400	111,700	66,700
Philadelphia, Pa.....	23,800	14,900	8,900
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	39,400	24,700	14,700
St. Louis, Mo.....	33,600	21,000	12,600
San Francisco, Calif.....	19,800	12,400	7,400
Toledo, Ohio.....	20,800	13,000	7,800

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This statement shows exactly what is going to happen in the various States as far as the W. P. A. workers are concerned. The statement shows reductions to a great extreme in the number of people employed on W. P. A. in the various States and cities. Now, let me ask, Who favors this condition and who is ready to assume the responsibility?

Let me ask, Is there any Member of this House who went before the people of his district and said, "If I am elected I am going to cut the appropriation for W. P. A."?

Well, there are mighty few. There certainly are not as many as those who are going to vote to cut the appropriation for W. P. A. Everybody is a pal of the unemployed and the W. P. A. worker in October before election. I wish that the W. P. A. worker would only see what his October pals are doing to him here in January. I say there would have been mighty few Members elected here if they had gone before the people in their districts and said they were going to cut W. P. A. if they were elected to the Congress of the United States. The mandate of the people was against any cutting of W. P. A. and you know it. Just because there may be one or two isolated instances of that character does not mean that the mandate of the American people was not to continue W. P. A., because the American people are interested in recovery and want to continue it by making it possible for anyone who cannot obtain a job in private industry to be able to get a W. P. A. job at a decent wage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The attacks made here on W. P. A. workers is wrong and un-American. The unemployed of this country do not want W. P. A. jobs and they do not want relief. The unemployed of this country want to work. They want to go back into private industry. However, as long as private industry fails to give the unemployed of this country an opportunity to work, then I say it is the solemn duty of the Government of the United States to give work to the unemployed Americans and to give them work at a decent wage, enough to support them in an American fashion during their period of unemployment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this point to insert in the RECORD two telegrams which I received from the mayor of San Francisco with reference to the pending bill. The first telegram reads as follows:

Heartily urge your strong support of the W. P. A. deficiency appropriation bill recommended by the President for balance of fiscal year. On behalf of San Francisco I endorse without qualification Mayor LaGuardia's presentation of urgent need for appropriation. Wired details of San Francisco's relief situation to Conference of Mayors last week and most emphatically urge your support of conference efforts to have the bill approved.

ANGELO J. ROSSI,
Mayor of San Francisco.

Upon receipt of this telegram I asked for more definite information with reference to relief conditions in San Francisco and received the following telegram:

In re wire received this p. m. Public Welfare Department Agency increase for December 1938 compared with December 1937: Indigent relief 7 percent, old-age aid 23 percent, blind aid 21 percent, half-orphan aid 14 percent, average 18 percent. Funds expended for public assistance exclusive of hospitalization and institutional care as for December 1, 1938—kinds of aid: Needy aged, needy blind, needy children, children in State school, county indigents. Sponsors' contribution to W. P. A. projects for month of November, \$662,791.13. Number of persons involved, 55,464. State relief administration caring for 15,016, W. P. A., 20,284. You can see, therefore, that although we have a total of 35,390 persons involved on S. R. A. and W. P. A., they are employable. Remainder of the 55,464 persons are unemployable unemployed. The situation in San Francisco has arrived at the point where we can no longer increase our output. It is imperative that the President's program be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the recommendations of the President and the mayors of the principal cities of this country and will vote for the larger amount.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. For a brief question.

Mr. SIROVICH. If the recommendation of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is adopted, there will be \$150,000,000 less available for relief. The statement

has been made on the floor of the House that such a cut would be instrumental in dropping from the relief rolls 1,100,000 unemployed, besides affecting adversely 750,000 who are qualified to go on relief.

The allegation has been made today by many Members of the House that politics has crept into relief. Does the distinguished gentleman, who has been a strong supporter of the working classes and one of the foremost champions of the underprivileged of our country, feel that those who are in penury, hunger, and want should be penalized for the indiscretion of others?

Mr. WELCH. In answer to my distinguished friend from New York, I would like to say that human needs and human misery should transcend party partisanship.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, to those of us of the minority who have on several occasions in years past brought out and dusted off the Democratic platform of 1932, and some of the earlier speeches of the President of the United States, which we believe to contain many sound fundamentals of government, it has been most gratifying to note today that there has been an apparent change in the disposition of some of the majority, that after 6 years of spending the public money without regard to the source from which it was coming the majority is beginning to realize that after all there is another class of people in this country who must be considered. For every 1 of the people who are dependent upon the public for support, there are 40 or 50 people who are supporting themselves, people who have had jobs and who have, through a voluntary self-denial, saved a little money and have been able to get along. Therefore, it is especially gratifying to see that the majority is beginning to realize that those 40 or 50 people must be considered along with that other 1.

It has been said by the former Administrator of the Works Progress Administration that unemployment will always be with us. He is alleged to have said also that this Government will continue to spend and spend and spend and to tax and tax and tax. Whether these words were ever spoken by Mr. Hopkins is of small moment. Certain it is that it is an expression of the philosophy and practices of the New Deal.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. COLE of New York. Please, no.

It is likewise encouraging to realize that the majority is beginning to understand that no government can continue to spend and spend and spend any more than it can continue to tax and tax and tax. There are definite limits beyond which we cannot go in either case. However that may be, it is apparent that the problem of relief is one which is going to face this country longer than from now until June, even further into the future than the next few years.

If that is so, or if it is true that unemployment is permanent, and that our relief system is to be permanent, then it is time for us to review the whole system of administration of relief in order that any abuses may be corrected, and we should view that problem realistically. Save in one instance, this afternoon I have heard but one person make the claim that there has been no political misuse of relief funds. I dare say each one of us will confess it has been abused, and probably most of us would be ready to see that these abuses are corrected.

The minority is ready to go along and take care of the unemployed people who are in need. We do, however, disapprove of the system under which it has been administered. In the past we have taken the position that the administration of relief can be done more economically if done locally. A few days past the President said there would be as much politics in relief if administered locally as there would be if administered as at present.

I can agree with him in part. I agree that there will be politics in relief, although I do disagree that it will be on the wholesale scale that it is at present if it were in the hands of the localities. Human nature knows no political

parties, and neither of them is a paragon of virtue. So long as two elements are lacking in the administration of relief, whether by the Nation or the State, there will be political abuse. One way to correct it is by making use of public funds for political purposes a criminal offense. This will tend to stop it, but another far more persuasive and effective instrument would be to require the localities themselves to foot a part of the bill. If any locality realizes that the money that is being spent, or a part of it at least, is coming from their own pocketbooks, they are going to be very sure that the person who gets the money actually needs it. They will see to it that there is no waste and no extravagance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Likewise, they are going to be sure that any person is not held off of the relief rolls irrespective of his political affiliations if he is in actual need of help. The amount of the local contribution is unimportant so long as it is enough to make them realize that it is their money that is being spent.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. No; I am sorry.

A proposal will be made by the minority, which, to my mind, will test the good faith of the majority. It is proposed by the minority as evidence of their good faith. We do not quibble over the amount of money involved. If the money is actually needed and will actually go into the pockets of those who are in need, we are for it. Our whole dispute is with the system through which it has been distributed. The responsibility for continuance of the W. P. A. under its present color and complexion rests solely with the majority.

If you are willing to accept our readiness to cooperate with you to clear up the whole situation and devise a system of administration that will be fair and just and honest to the taxpayer and those in need, then may we not accept the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that the whole problem may be studied and the evils remedied? If you refuse it and are unwilling to have the whole subject of relief scrutinized by this committee of Congress it must be taken by the country and your own consciences as an expression of your approval of the corruption, misuse, abuse, exploitation of the distressed and suffering of the country as has been characteristic of the W. P. A. in the years gone by.

The answer, of course, rests with you as to whether or not you want to continue the present system and thereby put your approval upon the continuance of such procedure and extravagance. For my own part I have consistently voted against every relief bill for that very reason. I am unwilling, by my affirmative vote, to give any semblance of sanction of the unwholesome mess of the present W. P. A. I am unwilling to have a single dollar spent for the very laudable purpose of relief knowing full well it is being diverted for purposes never intended, and unless some correction is made, I can see no other course for me than to act as I have in the past. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, when I asked the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] to yield, I wanted to call his attention to one of his statements. He is an honorable gentleman, and coming from him in particular I thought the inference of guilt with respect to the statement alleged to have been made by Mr. Hopkins was entirely unwarranted. We all know the story of that statement, and I do not think it becomes honorable gentlemen or honorable persons of either sex to try to send out to the public, by inference, that a man is guilty when his accuser is unseen and when the man himself has denied and denied and denied. I would take the same position if a similar accusation were made against anyone.

I value my character and reputation, and I respect the desire of all other persons to value and retain their character and reputation. The Dies committee, for example, has done a great job up to a certain extent, but the Dies committee made the unintentional mistake of permitting some witnesses to attack and to attempt to impair the character and reputation of some fine persons. I hope, as I am confident, that a future investigation will be careful in this respect. [Applause.] To hear Members on this floor try to send out by inference and innuendo the fact that Mr. Hopkins is guilty of an accusation made by some unseen person and admitted to have been made in a moment of relaxation, which the gentleman has denied repeatedly, seems to me to be unwarranted.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be pleased to yield.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, had I known the nature of the gentleman's interrogation I would have gladly yielded. The gentleman will recall I said "this alleged statement" which Mr. Hopkins made, and I completed the statement by saying "whether he made it or not is inconsequential."

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman had made the direct statement, it would have been more insignificant than trying to subtly convey by inference and innuendo that Mr. Hopkins was guilty of having made the statement. If the gentleman frankly apologized for any effort or intent on his part to convey by innuendo any such thought, the gentleman's position would be more sound than trying to strengthen the erroneous impression that he attempted to convey.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the membership of the House that without regard to the truth of the assertion as to what Mr. Hopkins said, there has been much in the conduct of Mr. Hopkins to indicate that his idea and the idea of many more operating with him has been to spend and spend and spend and tax and tax and tax and elect and elect and elect. What he said may not be as important as what he has done. Sometimes actions speak louder than words.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARTER].

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am proud that my first appearance on this spot should be in behalf of two of the groups of this country which have, I hope, been made unintentionally to suffer through maladministration of the W. P. A. set-up. I refer to those millions who, through no fault of their own, are needy, unemployed, and want to work; and the other group, the plain, garden variety of taxpayer.

It so happens that I come from the county of Erie, New York State, with a population of over 800,000, of which over 580,000 are residents of the city of Buffalo. This population compares with the last reported population of the following States:

About as great as Maine and greater than any one of the following-mentioned States, and greater than some combinations of two or three of these States: Utah, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, Delaware, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, New Mexico, Arizona.

My only purpose in bringing out these figures is to show some of the problems confronted in Erie County from a population concentration point of view.

I feel that all of us recognize the present necessity of appropriating funds for a period for W. P. A. use. Whether this necessity has arisen because of misuse of public funds is a burning question that should be determined, and soon, to the end that remedial action be taken to eliminate the possibility of a recurrence. We must realize that this money shall, at least in the future, be wisely expended for the purpose appropriated and not for political purposes by any person, political party, or group of persons. Whether we want to face the fact or not, the taxpayers, present and future, must pay interest on this money and must likewise pay off the principal, so we cannot talk in millions and billions without those important thoughts in mind.

If we are sincere in these convictions, and I am sure we are, while voting to carry on this necessary work let us at the same time set up the necessary machinery for this Congress to at once study the grave problems of W. P. A. from top to bottom.

I know it is honeycombed with politics. I know funds from W. P. A. have gone to help swell the political campaign funds of the majority party. I know that much of these funds that you appropriated last year were improperly used.

I know that the secretary of the Democratic Party in Erie County is, or was until November 1938, a cog in dispensing jobs, promotions, and patronage in that county for W. P. A. I know that this same Democratic secretary, working in the Democratic headquarters in Buffalo, called superintendents of projects in and gave them schedules for contributions to be taken from workers on W. P. A. for the party's political campaign. I know that workers on W. P. A. were told to "kick into this fund, or else." I know that at least one time-keeper on W. P. A. through that same Democratic organization, was given lists of taverns with receipt blanks, blank checks, and a list of suggested contributions to that Democratic organization 1938 campaign fund. He was told to go out and get the subscriptions. I know that women hired at the paltry stipend of sewing projects were told to "kick into" the Democratic coffer—and did. I know that employees on all of the W. P. A. projects in our county were told to buy tickets for Democratic shows, picnics, and other money-raising schemes. I know that boss and administrative positions are held by faithful party workers, irrespective of their qualifications, let alone needs, while needy persons really qualified are literally crying for a chance to work. Yes; I know of many other things equally bad in this political W. P. A. mess, and mark you, I do not come from Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Maryland, or other States where, according to newspaper reports, these public funds have been misused largely in vain attempts to gain political advantage.

You say, "Do you know whereof you speak?" And I answer in this manner by referring you to the official report of the United States Grand Jury for the Western District of New York, which report was handed up to Judge Knight on December 19, 1938. This investigation was made as a result of some information which came to me. So that you will get a little more of the picture: The district attorney handling the presentation to the grand jury sat in the Democratic headquarters as the adviser, while some of these contributions were being obtained and were coming in. Do not misunderstand me—I do not know that he personally knew about them at the time; however, during that time there were press reports indicating what was going on. Let us see what the grand jury said. I now quote from its report:

We have learned during the course of the investigation that on or about the 20th day of October 1938, Robert Gillen, secretary of the Democratic county committee, contacted James W. Morris, superintendent of construction, and all of the group superintendents of the W. P. A. in this area.

Continuing, the report says:

He requested these employees of the W. P. A. to come to Democratic headquarters.

I will say they did; let us look at the schedule of "suggested contributions" taken from the grand jury report, given to these men for the purpose of obtaining Democratic campaign funds. I quote:

Men earning—	
\$90 to \$100.....	\$5.00
\$117.....	10.00
\$125.....	12.50
\$150.....	20.00
\$175.....	30.00
\$200.....	50.00
\$250.....	75.00

Later the jury said:

They persisted in soliciting money from men who sorely needed that money to provide the necessities of life for themselves and their families.

Further, they say:

The conduct, the acts of the superintendent of construction and the group superintendents, might be termed by some criminal. We have chosen to be charitable. We merely term it their stupidity, their disloyalty, the acts of just another group of public servants who failed in the performance of their duty. We do not indict, but we do severely condemn.

I have given you a quotation of a small part of the grand-jury report. Incidentally, the grand jury commended the Administrator and Director of the W. P. A., as well as the district attorney. When the report was read, Judge Knight said, in part:

Now, it is obvious that the operation of W. P. A. and organizations of that kind cannot long serve their purpose if they are made the footstool of politics.

The purpose of W. P. A. is to furnish relief on an impartial and nonpartisan basis, not on the basis of political affiliation, because relief is not determined by affiliation but by circumstances.

In my opinion, a law is necessary to specifically prohibit political contributions from individuals on W. P. A. We have statutes which prohibit the solicitation of contributions through threats, intimidation, or coercion. Whether that statute was violated the court is inclined to take your view—that there was not sufficient cause for indictments.

So, with that conclusion, and in view of your recommendation, I feel that the public will be satisfied. This resolution will have a more far-reaching effect than the indictment and prosecution of a few individuals. I understand there have not been any indictments.

As a result of this report, 8 or 10 of the superintendents were discharged by the W. P. A. director. Needless to say, the same secretary who was at the bottom of the questionable quest for campaign funds still holds forth as the secretary of the Erie County Democratic organization.

Ladies and gentlemen, the story of capitalizing on the human misery and suffering of our needy people has created disgust that has permeated the atmosphere around our great country to the extent that we should act once and for all to put a definite stop to it, so that it cannot again be said that in this great democracy either the Democratic, or, yes, the Republican, or any other party, is taking these atrocious advantages of our needy, deserving people.

How can you know about such things in the W. P. A. organization without at once setting up the machinery in this body to go to the bottom of things? When can we to better advantage start the machinery running than now? If we do not do it now, having before us the official "inkling" of what is going on, is it not an outright indictment against this body? If we do not now so act, are not the needy justified in questioning our motives? Similarly, are not the taxpayers forced to look askance at our action? I stand for the fund appropriation, coupled with the setting up of a committee to thoroughly investigate. Yes, at the same time, let us protect the worker further. Let us make it a violation of the penal law to in any way solicit political contributions from W. P. A. workers. As an added incentive to the worker to repulse politics in the W. P. A., let us also make it similarly criminal for him to make such additions to a party's "hope chest."

By doing these things the people of this Nation will know that Congress is definitely putting us back on the road of true democracy. I am for appropriating the funds necessary, but I do urge that we couple with it this investigation. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I think that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] inadvertently or unintentionally made a remark a moment ago that in a way did reflect upon the character and integrity of some of his own colleagues. Knowing him as I do, the good man that he is, the distinguished man and eminently fair man that he is, I feel that his remarks were not intentional. He made reference to a committee upon which I have served during the past few months, and inferentially or directly accused the committee of the very thing of which he accused my colleague from New York [Mr. COLE]. I say to him that no member of that committee has engaged in character assassination or in an attempt in any way to impugn the character or integrity of any American citizen. The committee in no way condoned some of the loose statements made by witnesses who appeared before it in an attempt to make it a sounding board for their own views, and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts can no more accuse the members of that committee of engaging in the work of impugning the character and integrity of citizens of this country than he can accuse the Senate Judiciary Committee of attempting to assassinate the character of certain distinguished American citizens because of some loose statements, discreditable statements, that are being made before that committee with reference to Mr. Frankfurter, one of the ablest lawyers in this country, and other distinguished people in public office. I call upon my distinguished friend to clarify or correct his statement with reference to the Dies committee. Certainly as one member of that committee, I resent any accusation that I in any way was a party to an attempt to impugn the character of any American citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the remarks which I shall make in the main may be more pertinent to the relief bill which this committee will bring in later with reference to the next fiscal year. I think there are certain constructive suggestions which should be offered in advance for the committee's consideration.

The question has been asked, How can we reduce the enormous amount of money which we have been appropriating for the very worthy purpose of relief? I wish to make some suggestions of ways in which I think these amounts can be decreased without doing injustice to any proper beneficiary of relief funds.

In the first place, I think that the amount of money that is used in the administration of these relief funds is decidedly top heavy and can be very greatly decreased. I assume that there is not a Member of this House who has not heard the statement made in his own district over and over again that some people are drawing relief funds who are not entitled to such funds, and that others entitled to them are not receiving them. I am wondering if those who dwell in various political subdivisions in the States, and who are familiar with the people in their various localities, could not more adequately and more economically deal with these various beneficiaries of relief, and thereby reduce very greatly the expenditures for administration.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I wish to make these four suggestions and, if I have any time then, I shall be glad to yield. I wish to make a further suggestion with reference to agricultural laborers. In a relief bill last year I offered an amendment which passed this House practically unanimously, but which was so modified in another body that it lost its force, to the effect that when these laborers were offered private employment they would either have to accept it or get off relief rolls, provided that private employment paid a compensation

equivalent to that they were drawing on relief. No longer ago than this week I received a letter from a farmer in my district telling me of agricultural laborers on relief in that section to whom he had offered greater compensation to do agricultural work than they were receiving on relief, but they preferred to remain on relief. The amendment I offered provided that they be reentered on the relief rolls after the termination of such private employment if still eligible.

Down in the section where I live that is peculiarly true of many domestic servants. So I say, if you will place in the relief bill for next year a provision that when such laborers are offered private employment and do not accept it, they shall have to get off of the relief rolls, provided it pays them equivalent compensation to that which they are receiving on relief, you will go a great way toward remedying the situation.

Now, if you want to reduce, and reduce very materially, the funds which are being applied to relief in this country, in what a staggering sum you can do that if you will provide that this money taken from American taxpayers shall be paid only to American citizens. [Applause.] I, for one, deplore the tendency in this country to tax our loyal people, to give relief through money or employment, to aliens; people who have lived here long enough to have become citizens of this country, if they had so desired, and have not done so. If we can believe the speeches we have heard upon the floor of this House today, then many of those to whom we are paying these funds are not in sympathy either with the ideas or ideals upon which our American Government is founded. I think in some respects we are international easymarks, and in my judgment you cannot find under God's shining sun a single nation which is giving anything like the equivalent consideration to American citizens abroad that we are bestowing upon aliens, who have lived here, some of them, through generations without evidencing any desire to become citizens of this country. [Applause.]

I would like to call attention to another thing. This would not reduce the amount to be devoted to relief purposes, but I think it is a pertinent suggestion, and I have made it heretofore on the floor of this House.

The W. P. A. in its projects is peculiarly a civilian operation. There are many civil engineers, and competent ones, in this country out of employment. It has always seemed to me that those in charge of civilian engineering projects in this Government agency should be civil engineers as contradistinguished from military engineers.

I have no quarrel to find with Army engineers. They have done wonderful work. At the time I brought this to the attention of the House a year or two ago, there were 20 or 30 Army engineers holding key positions in the W. P. A., a civilian undertaking for the relief of civilians. We have heard today a message from the President of the United States with reference to the necessity for an appropriation for adequate defense in this country, in matériel and in personnel. Surely under such circumstances there must be places in the Army for those Army engineers to carry on the work for which they originally received their commissions. I say this in no spirit of animosity, but I say it in a spirit of the proper performance of duty; a duty to which men are properly assigned.

Military engineering is very different from civil engineering. These undertakings carried on through the W. P. A. are primarily civilian undertakings. Consequently, I think the militaristic aspect should be withdrawn from them, and they should be directed in key positions by men who are familiar with civil engineering in its various phases.

I am making no attack upon the distinguished gentleman who has been named as Administrator of the W. P. A. I am sure he is very competent and has performed his services with distinction. But there have been and there may be now throughout this organization many Army engineers who, in my judgment, might very appropriately be

put back to their work in the War Department, in military engineering, and leave these civilian engineering operations to competent civil engineers.

I believe that these first three suggestions I have made, of reducing the cost of administration, of providing that these agricultural and domestic workers may not have the privilege of remaining on relief when offered equivalent positions in private employment, and by reducing the expenditures of the money taken from the pockets of American taxpayers by applying the funds to American citizens, and by placing the civilian operations in the hands of capable and efficient civil engineers and officers will, if adopted, materially reduce the appropriation required. Without doing any injustice to anyone properly a beneficiary of our bounty under relief we may be able to reduce greatly the expenses and to promote the efficiency of this agency of the Government. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] if he would be willing to answer a question in my time.

Mr. LANHAM. Certainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I trust the gentleman does not wish to remove the Army engineers from the work on flood relief. They have been invaluable to us in New England. If they were removed from that work, we would suffer very much.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say in response to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I realize there are some phases of this work which have a military significance, and perhaps for that reason it is very proper to have an Army officer in control of that work. One is now Administrator of the W. P. A., but I think the lady will find upon investigation that these many Army engineers who have been serving with the W. P. A. have been by no means restricted to work of the character that has to do with the things that are useful to us from a military standpoint, either in time of peace or in war.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad to have the gentleman say that he feels the Army engineers should be kept in charge of certain W. P. A. work.

The gentleman has spoken of the fact that a good many have refused to leave W. P. A. work to go into private employment. One explanation of that is because if anyone once leaves W. P. A. for other employment and that employment ceases, it is almost impossible for him to be taken back on the W. P. A.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I know we are all agreed that work relief must continue until we can transfer these people into private industry.

I have received many discouraging letters from the State of Indiana complaining about politics in W. P. A. It is shameful that such a situation should exist.

At a recent meeting of some of the new Congressmen from Indiana with the State administrator, John K. Jennings, it was agreed by all that politics should be divorced from relief. I believe that Mr. Jennings will do everything in his power to eliminate such practices.

Be assured that I will cooperate in every manner possible to assist him, because it is my belief that the W. P. A. appropriation is meant for all of the people of all political parties. My vote for the new appropriation bill will be cast in that light.

I believe that all of those W. P. A. workers who were removed since the last election, November 8, 1938, should be returned to the rolls, unless they have received gainful employment in private industry.

I believe that bosses and timekeepers should be taken from the relief rolls.

I believe that bosses, timekeepers, and employees should receive the same wages.

I believe that wages should be uniform throughout the United States.

It was unfortunate, indeed, to have a shortage of funds, which made it necessary to remove our old people over 65 years, who were on W. P. A., and force them to accept direct relief, or to mortgage their little homes, earned by hard work and thrift, to accept old-age assistance.

This country has the natural wealth, the resources, the raw materials, the manpower, the factories and industrial machinery to give every American family all it needs in the way of food, clothing, education, luxuries, and pleasures.

There is food enough to feed every hungry person; there is enough wool, cotton, and silk to clothe every man, woman, and child in the country; there are materials in mines and forests, mills, factories, and warehouses to house every family in America in a modern home; there are raw products and modern machines sufficient to equip these homes with both necessities and luxuries; there are idle railroad engines and freight cars waiting to transport these needs of men to every nook and corner of the country. Are we going to use these things or are we going ahead with the present confused state of affairs?

The United States for years has been conserving forests, lands, wild game, and oil. We guard the flying geese and ducks and we protect the mineral wealth under our ground. I believe it is time we started to conserve human beings, to make life comfortable for our old folks and at the same time make life secure for our younger people by making them certain of jobs, plenty of food, and the comforts of life.

When the wage earner has toiled for 40 years or more he and she should be retired with a pension that will enable them to live in comfort the rest of their days. Our old people should not be relegated to the junk heap the same way as we do a worn-out machine!

We owe a duty to these old folks, and I believe we can perform this duty. Make jobs for the younger people and make America prosperous again.

Today we are borrowing billions to meet unemployment and to give the mass of our people a meager living, and we are only borrowing the United States into bankruptcy.

We have tried this plan and it has failed. I for one am ready to try something else.

In 1917 and 1918 we loaned billions of dollars to foreign nations, and while we never got this money back, it did create a velocity of spending in this country which gave us an era of great prosperity. If we put money in the hands of our old people to give them comfort, why will it not work out the same way when they spend it?

Look at this picture—millions are idle in a land of plenty. Cheap prison-made goods and foreign-made goods are flooding the United States markets. Men with big farms and money are holding down W. P. A. jobs. Crop control with millions undernourished and imported agricultural products. Shame on us for permitting such a situation to exist.

Give us the Townsend plan and we will not need the W. P. A., crop control, and many other Government agencies. The kind of America I want to live in will give all of our people the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If anyone here has a better plan, bring it out before it is too late. [Applause.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have, of course, together with most of the Members, been greatly disappointed that no permanent plan is yet specified for relief after 6 long years. We have the comforting assurance only, in the report before us, that it is patent that in this short time we cannot formulate a new plan and that a special committee or commission had better be set up, that a plan can be presented to us for a long-range program before the 1940 relief money is appropriated.

While the report is quite satisfactory in its brevity, and plainly written, there is one error I want to correct now, lest I forget it. You will recall that last year some of us made the statement, after information received, that 61

cents only out of the relief dollar found its way into the pocket of the reliefer; that the rest went for materials, supervision, more supervision, and racketeering. In this report it says \$52.50 per project worker; \$6.50 nonlabor cost, and \$2 administrative cost. I will remind you in this connection that the local municipalities are, of course, expected to furnish the money for the materials before they get W. P. A. assistance. Therefore it will still hold that 61 cents of the dollar is about the sum to reach the reliefer. One of my friends on my right rushed to the telephone at the time this computation was quoted, and called up Mr. Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins said that 69 cents out of the dollar reached the pocket of the person on relief. If he said 69, I think we had better be conservative and call it 61.

Last year there was great delight on the majority side of the House because the relief bill, having been loaded down with large sums for pump priming, the minority might not vote for it; and it was freely predicted that if we did not vote for it we would probably be defeated. Well, every single Republican in this House at that time, as you know—every single one of them—was reelected; and all but seven or eight Republicans voted against that relief bill last year. So I say to you new Republicans that this W. P. A. business is not as persuasive with the voter, now, as you might think. I have noted the following comment, "The burial of the Republican Party was a poor job. You see it was a W. P. A. project."

A little while ago our colleague [Mr. HALLECK] was talking about "spending ourselves into prosperity." I suggested that it was another brand of an old and impossible doctrine: "Drink yourself sober." I would like to enlarge upon that simply by saying that a man in a drunken condition had asked the waiter to bring him something to sober him up, the waiter replied: "I will immediately bring you the check." [Laughter.] And the check in that case, of course, meant his bill, lest you misunderstand me. And when the bill is presented later on to our people, certainly there will be a sobering up.

Now, let us look at this thing seriously. The morale of our people. I want to talk about it. We get used to social security and lean too heavily upon it—and that is what we are even now doing, as everybody knows who has anything to do with the administration thereof, as was recently illustrated in one of my local papers a little while ago. Many have been on this relief program ever since it was started and obviously have no intention of getting a job. Why, it is more permanent than any private industry, apparently. But the illustration: He was injured on the job. The foreman met his little daughter. "Well, when will your father probably come back to work?" "I do not think for a long time; 'compensation' has set in."

The only real comfort, you know, if comfort it can be called, is, as I have stated before, that when the bill is finally handed down to our children and our grandchildren there will be back of it a knowledge that rather than pay, they having to pay it, it will probably be politely repudiated. I think we must feel that way. And this reminds me—it may be illustrative, I think—a friend who visited Sandy in the hospital after his operation was asked, "Did you offer Sandy any comfort and encouragement?"

"Oh, yes; Sandy was complaining about the bill that he would have to pay the hospital for the operation, and I told him 'Well, Sandy, brighten up; you may not live to pay it.'"

If that is the sort of comfort you have, well and good. I have just noted that former Comptroller General John R. McCarl made a few statements recently which, I think, well put and which should give us real cause for consideration although I do not care to be too argumentative at this late hour in the afternoon.

He says that Congress must have learned from so many futile experiments. He wrote as follows:

We cannot make everybody rich and happy by law.
We cannot tax our way to needed reforms and improvements.
We cannot borrow our way to prosperity.

We cannot build an enduring social security on the quicksands of public debt.

We cannot succeed in self-government by building government up—and us down.

We cannot induce frugality, self-respect, or self-reliance by providing dole instead of opportunity.

We cannot rob the country of money, tax our people white, and expect jobs to increase or pay envelopes to expand.

We have learned that cannot be done.

We cannot expect our youth to be filled with hope when it can see action in nothing but government—or wildly patriotic when its expectancy is a yoke of debt.

Government spending on public buildings, on publicly owned facilities and utilities which may in some measure add to the national wealth but not to that by which we live and grow—wheel-turning national income.

Internal national income is what we want. I had voted for all relief bills until last year. After having tried to amend them as best we could, and those being the only bills which we had before us to vote up or down, I voted for them until one for \$4,800,000,000, with all sorts of pump-priming vagaries included therein, was presented.

Personally, I am inclined to compliment the gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the subcommittee. Even a little digression from the path of rectitude as outlined by the White House is highly suggestive of a purge to come. Stubbornness is not lacking in the White House. You are expected to vote for the entire amount of eight hundred and fifty millions. It is apparently acknowledged that they do not expect times to get much better. I am therefore inclined at this moment to vote for the bill presented by the gentleman from Virginia, supported by a large majority of his committee. I am sure that if it can later on be shown that times are so bad and that people are starving or in need, we shall be glad to vote a supplementary appropriation before this Congress adjourns. But just now the basis of their request is not sufficient to cause us to vote the entire amount.

I again warn this House. We cannot spend ourselves into prosperity. We are being frightened into voting large sums for national defense. We should inquire into that most carefully. Certainly we should not be criticised, because sincerity and sympathy for the poor is just as deep in our hearts as in the heart of the occupant of the White House. We are merely not so stubborn, which proves that we are even more sincere in trying to arrive at a proper judgment.

I want to remind you further, that many items for relief are included in other appropriation bills and we should watch such items carefully. There are many ways in which our money is being wasted. One billion dollars has been squandered in the buying of silver and a large part of it has been buried in the ground. The people seem totally uninformed on the silver question. Somebody at some time should take the floor and make a complete statement with reference to that subject.

They have changed the name of the old resettlement vagaries. Is it not now the Farm Security Administration? They have some 90 of these resettlement schemes scattered over the country. The futility of them and the favoritism shown in reaching only a few and not taking care of the multitude, should be kept in mind, and better understood by everyone. If these wild schemes are to be called by new names and hidden somewhere under regular appropriations, how are we to learn the exact conditions and actual amounts expended for relief?

You perhaps read last week the statement of a man who resigned, regarding the 60 families in Gila Valley. An initial cost of \$500,000, built up absolutely on the Russian system, except that the Government was to get half the profits in cash, if and when there were any profits. He should now be willing to tell us about it since he has been separated from his job.

Those bad eggs have been transferred to another basket, but their upkeep is still there and they are still highly expensive, futile propositions. It is not only this relief proposition under W. P. A. which is in effect before us today.

There are hidden many other methods of spending money largely for the same general purpose.

I do not like the jokes on the W. P. A. You may think I do because sometimes I speak in a manner that may leave that impression, but I do so only for illustrative purposes. Frankly, I do not like to see a man work out in the snow and slush trying to put in his 3 days in order to get \$13, or see a struggling white-collared worker beside those always used to manual labor.

I have seen enough of this building of stone walls in sparsely settled areas, men from the cities being transported many miles by trucks in all sorts of conditions. These walls generally are built on land which is not worth \$1 an acre. This made work is just to preserve their manhood; at least, so it is stated. I would vote tomorrow for a direct payment of \$15 or more, according to a reliever's necessity. I read that a Senator in the other branch will recommend that relief money be distributed to the State on a per capita basis. In some localities you can live cheaply, as compared to other sections where it costs much more even to exist.

Would it not be glorious for the wealthier States to furnish the money to other States which are located in favorable climatic sections, "per capita"? I favor sending Federal relief funds to the municipalities, to be administered by non-bipartisan boards and by persons not up for election year after year; boards which would not be politically minded and which would determine whether funds should be used for W. P. A. made work, so-called, or for direct relief methods, as might be deemed best by them. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, we have heard this afternoon on one occasion something about the latent consuming power that is present in the homes in America, and in the same speech a suggestion that, therefore, the amount appropriated in this resolution for work for the unemployed should be reduced. I cannot understand the logic of such a position.

Of course, there is tremendous latent consuming power in the homes of America. The only trouble is that the people do not have the money with which to express that consuming power and to become an active part of the market. Our job in this Congress is to work out a way in which that can be done, and to do this without a continuously mounting national debt. The only reason we do not attack this job more directly than we are doing is because of the opposition of the very same people who want to cut this appropriation.

However, that is not the immediate problem that confronts us. The problem that immediately confronts us is one in which the livelihood and opportunity to work of some 500,000 people is immediately at stake.

May I say at this point that if anyone offers an amendment, with as much teeth in it as he wants, to make it a punishable offense for any official to use any of the money we will appropriate in order to bring political pressure on W. P. A. workers I will vote for that amendment? I may say further that I wish the Hatch amendment had passed the Senate last year. May I say in the third place that the people who are going to get hurt if you cut this appropriation are not any of those who have benefited either on the Republican or on the Democratic side by political activities, such as there may have been, but those who have been the victims of such circumstances—people who now need a job of some kind to carry on and support their families.

ABOUT POLITICS IN RELIEF

My experience in California—and I know something about the situation in California—has been this, and it is also the situation in every other State where the State has taken the trouble to set up relief machinery of its own. No one in our State has been able at any time to get a job on W. P. A. unless certified by the State relief administration. The State relief administration was until the 1st day of this month in the hands of the Republican State administration of California.

In every State where there has been such a certifying agency the W. P. A. has used it. Therefore, in studying the situation carefully, I find there was no politics in relief to any great extent in our State, and such as there may have been was probably to a large extent Republican politics rather than Democratic politics. I do not believe that is the issue. Certainly I have never in my life asked a man who needed a job what political party he belonged to.

Let me cite this example: The rolls in California last fall were increased somewhat. Why? Because on the basis of the figures submitted by our Republican State relief administration it was found there was need for an increase. That was the reason. It was a matter of need concerning which Republicans and Democrats agreed.

It also is true that my State has carried over a period of time approximately one-half of the load of the employable unemployed in addition to direct relief for the unemployable people all the time, and we are asking that we not be requested to do more.

WHAT DOES THIS PROPOSED CUT MEAN?

The situation I wish to present to you is this: To appropriate \$875,000,000 at this time means cutting 300,000 people from the rolls before the end of the present fiscal year. To appropriate \$725,000,000 means that 500,000 additional people must be kicked off the jobs they now have. And that means 500,000 heads of families deprived of jobs and forced onto relief rolls—if any.

THE REAL ISSUE

The real issue that confronts us does not involve the President or Mr. Hopkins or Mr. Williams or anyone else like that, except insofar as these men have defended the unemployed. But I do say this: If anyone could have undertaken this tremendous task, ordered forward and back by the Congress from time to time, employing now 3,000,000, now 1,500,000 people, subjected to all manner of local pressures, and done a better job than has been done, I would like to know who it is. The issue, however, is what you are going to do about the unemployed and the revival of consumer demand in this country in the next 5 months.

The arguments of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] have not yet been answered. None of the authorities he cited showing the need for at least \$875,000,000 has been answered. Not a speech has been made on this floor that has successfully refuted the argument submitted by the gentleman from Missouri. I say that because I will not have anywhere near the time I need to complete my speech. I refer you, therefore, back to his.

WHO IS THIS MAN?

The man you have to consider in this situation is a type of man that we all too often forget here in the House. May I picture him to you as though he were standing before you. He is the typical W. P. A. worker as I know him. He has come to my office, over and over, not to ask direct relief, not to ask something for nothing, but because he wants more efficient work, because he wants a harder job, yes, because he wants better pay, and I think he should have it.

This man has gray about his temples. He is about 48 or 50 years of age, and I challenge anyone on either side of the House to stand up and say a man of that age can get a job in private industry today. He simply cannot do it.

This typical worker is a man with a family. He has three children, the oldest of whom is just getting through high school. He either has a mortgage on his home or he pays rent and has a hard time to meet his rent payments. He is not a Communist, a Nazi, or anything else but a perfectly good American, like you and me.

I have heard the innuendos that have been cast at this man this afternoon by some Members. If I should rise here today and pick out one wealthy individual in this country and talk about the things he has done and how bad they were, I would be subject to the very logical charge that I was not representing honestly or fairly the people of means in this country. I counter with the statement that neither is

it fair to charge the poor people of the country with all of the things that have been mentioned here today. They are the victims not of one man or of any one political party's policies but the victims of our failure as yet to adjust our national life to the machine age. This typical man wants a job, that is all.

A CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSAL

I am going to tell you a little bit about a bill I have introduced. It provides for a combination of W. P. A. and P. W. A. in one bureau, the carrying on of all public works employment by that bureau, the oversight over that program by a board of nine people, no more than five of whom shall be of one political party. My bill provides for the unemployed a program of work that needs to be done in this country, and a program whereby the work would be run on the basis of a standard number of hours per week, with prevailing wages paid. Under my bill work could be carried on either by contract, through grants to States and cities, or through Federal direct employment.

I cannot describe all the features of this bill at this time, but I have introduced it because for years I have believed this program should not be on a relief basis, but that people should be certified for work by the United States Employment Service rather than by a relief agency. I still believe that. I submit, however, that the consideration of any such measure—and I do not know that my own bill is the best one that could be drawn—is going to take time. It cannot be done in a moment and should not be done in a moment. Provision must be made for shifting people from one program to another. The issue before us today is whether or not we are going to vent such feeling and prejudices as we may have on the helpless unemployed people of this country by cutting the appropriation, or whether we are going to vote the \$875,000,000 which as a minimum is necessary in order to protect the right to life of these people whose very lives lie in our hands now, and, having done that, proceed to the constructive job of working out a unified, flexible, long-range program of public works.

WHY NOT READ THE RECORD?

If you will go back to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1937, you will find that in the spring of 1937 the same speeches were made about cutting down Government expenditures, about turning business loose, about how business would reabsorb these people. The very same things were said then that are being said now. The House listened, cut the appropriation, and the recession followed.

I have talked to people who are little-business men in this country. We have not got prosperity back yet, and if you cut off these 500,000 people you are going to deal a severe blow to the revival now taking place. We still need expansion; and, though this is frankly not my first choice of a way to get it, it is far, far better than nothing.

When we had a cut of 5,000 out in my State a little while ago there was a meeting that took place, an orderly, quiet meeting of about 300 heads of families in a vacant lot on one of the boulevards that runs between a couple of the towns in my district, and in that meeting there were speeches made by these men who said, "We believe that we, as American citizens, have a right to work. We ask not that we be given something for nothing, but we ask a chance to make our constructive contribution to the life of the American Nation."

This is the task of Congress. Bring in suggestions, for Heaven's sake, that are constructive suggestions. Bring in suggestions as to how we can improve the program, but do not think that anybody is going to be deceived about your real intention if you start out to improve the program by first kicking 500,000 people out into the street in helplessness.

ACTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

We have heard a lot today in the way of criticism of the W. P. A. To keep the record straight, I wish to include something on the constructive accomplishments of the people employed on W. P. A.

In the 4-month period from July to November 1938 W. P. A. workers built or improved 30,000 miles of roads and streets, the largest proportion of which was in rural areas.

In that same period W. P. A. workers completed 4,000 new bridges and 52,000 new culverts, laid 1,500 miles of sidewalks and paths and more than 56,000,000 linear feet of roadside drainage ditches. The figures I mention represent only projects brought to completion during the 4-month period, and do not include work done on approximately 10,300 other highway projects which still were in operation at the end of the period.

Because of the large opportunity for the employment of unskilled labor, and because of the widespread demand for better roads, highway projects constitute a major phase of the W. P. A. construction program. More than 47 percent of all persons employed by the W. P. A. are at work on projects of this type.

The attached figures show that 2,531 miles of new highways were built by the W. P. A. from July to November 1938, and that repairs and improvements were made on 28,085 miles of existing roads. Rural roads, mostly of the farm-to-market type, comprised the biggest group within the category, with 1,372 miles of new construction (622 miles of which were paved) and 24,395 miles repaired or improved.

Such roads are vital lines of communications to millions of farmers throughout the country, being in many instances their only access to urban markets. Many of these roads have been in a poor state of repair and impassable during much of the year. The improvement of farm-to-market roads has been an important objective of the W. P. A. since its inception 3½ years ago, and in that time the program has converted tens of thousands of miles of fair-weather roads to year-round usefulness.

Bridge construction and repair formed another important phase of the highway program, with 4,090 new structures completed and repairs and improvements to 1,728. Of the total, 4,137 were wood, 1,020 masonry, and 661 steel. Their aggregate length was 173,395 feet, or slightly more than 32 miles.

Other accomplishments during the 4-month period include 1,550 miles of new or improved sidewalks and paths, 1,233 miles of new or improved curbs, 297 miles of new or improved gutters, 10,790 miles of new or improved roadside drainage, and 1,315 miles of roadside landscaping. New culverts numbered 52,040, with an aggregate length of 243 miles.

Following is a tabulation showing the projects completed during the period July 1 to November 1, 1938, with a breakdown of the data by States, on the basis of reports received by Colonel Harrington, Works Progress Administrator:

Physical accomplishment on W. P. A. highway, road, and street projects, completed between July 1 and Nov. 1, 1938

[Preliminary—Subject to revision]

UNITED STATES SUMMARY

Type	Unit of measurement	Number	
		New construction	Improvements
HIGHWAYS, ROADS, STREETS, AND RELATED FACILITIES			
Highways, roads, and streets (total).....	Miles.....	2,531.2	28,084.7
Paved.....	Miles.....	1,544.4	
Unpaved.....	Miles.....	986.8	
Rural roads (total).....	Miles.....	1,372.3	24,395.1
Paved.....	Miles.....	622.3	
Unpaved.....	Miles.....	750.0	
Urban roads and streets (total).....	Miles.....	956.5	3,106.6
Paved.....	Miles.....	892.9	
Unpaved.....	Miles.....	63.6	

Physical accomplishment on W. P. A. highway, road, and street projects, completed between July 1 and Nov. 1, 1938—Continued

UNITED STATES SUMMARY—continued

Type	Unit of measure- ment	Number	
		New con- struction	Improve- ments
HIGHWAYS, ROADS, STREETS, AND RELATED FACILITIES—continued			
Highway, roads, and streets (cont).			
Other—parks, cemeteries, etc. (total).	Miles.....	202.4	583.0
Paved.....	Miles.....	29.2	
Unpaved.....	Miles.....	173.2	
Road shoulders (not included above)	Miles.....	270.3	2,220.7
Bridges (total).....	Number.....	4,090	1,728
	Length in feet.....	99,789	73,606
Wood.....	Number.....	3,164	973
	Length in feet.....	68,318	29,873
Steel.....	Number.....	197	464
	Length in feet.....	10,306	36,341
Masonry.....	Number.....	729	291
	Length in feet.....	21,165	7,392
Culverts.....	Number.....	52,041	3,917
	Length in feet.....	1,285,050	108,215
Grade-crossing elimination.....	Number of cross- ing eliminations.....	3	
Sidewalks and paths (total)	Miles.....	1,144.7	406.0
Paved.....	Miles.....	996.5	
Unpaved.....	Miles.....	148.2	
Curbs.....	Length in miles.....	1,037.9	196.2
Gutters.....	Length in miles.....	269.0	28.8
Guardrails and guardwalks.....	Length in miles.....	62.5	32.0
Lights for roads and streets.....	Number.....	682	706
	Miles of road equipped.....	16	33
Roadside drainage.....	Linear feet of ditch.....	19,153,458	37,193,354
	Linear feet of pipe.....	682,021	61,994
Roadside landscaping.....	Miles.....		1,315
Removal of car and railroad track.....	Miles of single- line track.....		72.4

ALL HIGHWAYS, ROADS, AND STREETS

State	New construction			Improvements— total miles
	Total miles	Miles of paved roads	Miles of unpaved roads	
Grand total.....	2,531.2	1,544.4	986.8	28,084.7
Continental United States.....	2,529.5	1,543.6	985.9	28,084.7
Alabama.....	17.8	17.8	(1)	87.5
Arizona.....	9.0	5.7	3.3	139.8
Arkansas.....	50.8	19.0	31.8	953.9
California.....	63.9	34.4	29.5	193.1
Colorado.....	39.1	13.2	25.9	340.6
Connecticut.....	56.0	12.2	43.8	336.3
Delaware.....	5.2	.2	5.0	.7
District of Columbia.....	1.2	.7	.5	2.0
Florida.....	24.1	7.6	16.5	114.2
Georgia.....	7.7	7.7	(1)	67.5
Idaho.....	2.7	.3	2.4	250.5
Illinois.....	443.5	315.8	127.7	3,572.7
Indiana.....	257.5	213.0	44.5	1,898.3
Iowa.....	4.2	1.2	3.0	1,021.9
Kansas.....	12.7	4.3	8.4	204.1
Kentucky.....	24.0	22.9	1.1	743.2
Louisiana.....	2.7	2.0	.7	(1)
Maine.....	11.4	(1)	11.4	18.4
Maryland.....	3.7	1.6	2.1	37.7
Massachusetts.....	20.4	8.0	12.4	96.3
Michigan.....	150.9	141.1	9.8	1,129.5
Minnesota.....	11.1	1.1	10.0	741.2
Mississippi.....	55.8	55.0	.8	1,962.7
Missouri.....	47.7	11.5	36.2	669.8
Montana.....	2.0	(1)	2.0	440.3
Nebraska.....	52.1	1.9	50.2	236.9
Nevada.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	134.3
New Hampshire.....	1.4	1.0	.4	74.9
New Jersey.....	120.0	104.5	15.5	324.2
New Mexico.....	22.2	1.7	20.5	77.6
New York.....	104.9	56.6	48.3	252.0
North Carolina.....	3.5	1.6	1.9	770.1
North Dakota.....	4.0	2.1	1.9	293.1
Ohio.....	33.5	32.4	1.1	236.4
Oklahoma.....	10.1	8.1	2.0	1,587.7
Oregon.....	8.4	(1)	8.4	336.5
Pennsylvania.....	146.5	91.2	55.3	366.7
Rhode Island.....	10.9	10.8	.1	62.9
South Carolina.....	10.7	10.5	.2	311.8

¹No report received.

Physical accomplishment on W. P. A. highway, road, and street projects, completed between July 1 and Nov. 1, 1938—Continued

ALL HIGHWAYS, ROADS, AND STREETS—continued

State	New construction			Improvements— total miles
	Total miles	Miles of paved roads	Miles of unpaved roads	
South Dakota.....	5.6	1.6	4.0	515.3
Tennessee.....	72.4	71.3	1.1	1,162.5
Texas.....	146.2	142.2	4.0	1,884.2
Utah.....	49.2	1.9	47.3	271.8
Vermont.....	2.5	(1)	(1)	44.8
Virginia.....	10.6	10.4	.2	211.1
Washington.....	59.4	11.3	48.1	2,094.8
West Virginia.....	321.7	82.3	239.4	1,575.4
Wisconsin.....	8.6	1.4	7.2	223.2
Wyoming.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	14.3
Hawaii.....	1.7	.8	.9	(1)

RURAL ROADS

Grand total.....	1,372.3	622.3	750.0	24,395.1
Continental United States.....	1,371.2	622.1	749.1	24,395.1
Alabama.....	16.6	16.6	(1)	77.5
Arizona.....	7.3	4.0	3.3	138.9
Arkansas.....	26.2	2.5	23.7	938.8
California.....	31.8	20.8	11.0	148.5
Colorado.....	26.9	2.0	24.9	326.6
Connecticut.....	41.3	(1)	41.3	309.4
Delaware.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
District of Columbia.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Florida.....	20.6	5.5	15.1	99.0
Georgia.....	6.3	6.3	(1)	65.9
Idaho.....	1.0	(1)	1.0	182.0
Illinois.....	115.6	29.4	86.2	2,995.9
Indiana.....	150.8	122.4	28.4	1,655.4
Iowa.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	987.3
Kansas.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	139.2
Kentucky.....	1.3	1.3	(1)	717.9
Louisiana.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Maine.....	10.8	(1)	10.8	17.2
Maryland.....	1.2	.2	1.0	34.8
Massachusetts.....	11.2	.1	11.1	55.2
Michigan.....	119.2	118.0	1.2	407.3
Minnesota.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	683.1
Mississippi.....	17.3	16.9	.4	1,954.8
Missouri.....	2.6	1.0	1.6	402.6
Montana.....	1.5	(1)	1.5	404.9
Nebraska.....	47.0	(1)	47.0	214.7
Nevada.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	54.0
New Hampshire.....	1.2	1.0	.2	61.0
New Jersey.....	18.3	5.1	13.2	122.2
New Mexico.....	16.9	(1)	16.9	58.4
New York.....	81.4	33.8	47.6	195.6
North Carolina.....	1.4	1.4	(1)	691.9
North Dakota.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	216.9
Ohio.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	170.7
Oklahoma.....	7.6	7.6	(1)	1,666.1
Oregon.....	4.9	(1)	4.9	232.1
Pennsylvania.....	52.9	25.6	27.3	269.6
Rhode Island.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	20.2
South Carolina.....	2.2	2.2	(1)	287.1
South Dakota.....	1.4	(1)	1.4	489.8
Tennessee.....	49.0	49.0	(1)	1,138.1
Texas.....	94.6	90.9	3.7	1,746.1
Utah.....	42.8	1.0	41.8	144.4
Vermont.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	36.4
Virginia.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	205.4
Washington.....	48.8	6.5	42.3	2,006.8
West Virginia.....	286.1	51.0	235.1	1,533.7
Wisconsin.....	5.2	(1)	5.2	179.1
Wyoming.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	12.6
Hawaii.....	1.1	.2	.9	(1)

URBAN ROADS AND STREETS

Grand total.....	956.5	892.9	63.6	3,106.6
Continental United States.....	955.9	892.3	63.6	3,106.6
Alabama.....	1.2	1.2	(1)	5.0
Arizona.....	1.7	1.7	(1)	(1)
Arkansas.....	17.2	15.4	1.8	14.5
California.....	15.3	13.6	1.7	35.6
Colorado.....	11.2	11.2	(1)	5.0
Connecticut.....	14.6	12.1	2.5	23.4
Delaware.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	.7
District of Columbia.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Florida.....	1.9	1.6	.3	13.3
Georgia.....	1.4	1.4	(1)	1.2
Idaho.....	.3	.3	(1)	16.2
Illinois.....	313.2	281.0	32.2	539.7
Indiana.....	91.6	86.2	5.4	237.4
Iowa.....	1.8	1.1	.7	30.7
Kansas.....	2.9	2.9	(1)	62.6
Kentucky.....	21.2	21.2	(1)	25.2
Louisiana.....	2.2	2.0	.2	(1)
Maine.....	.4	(1)	.4	1.2
Maryland.....	1.1	1.1	(1)	2.8
Massachusetts.....	7.3	6.6	.7	7.7

¹No report received.

Physical accomplishment on W. P. A. highway, road, and street projects, completed between July 1 and Nov. 1, 1938—Continued

URBAN ROADS AND STREETS—continued

State	New construction			Improvements—total miles
	Total miles	Miles of paved roads	Miles of unpaved roads	
Michigan	26.8	21.6	5.2	718.1
Minnesota	2.0	1.1	.9	51.6
Mississippi	38.2	38.0	.2	7.9
Missouri	9.6	9.6	(¹)	65.0
Montana	.5	(¹)	.5	15.4
Nebraska	2.0	1.9	.1	19.1
Nevada	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	8.7
New Hampshire	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	5.2
New Jersey	99.5	98.7	.8	201.7
New Mexico	.8	.8	(¹)	19.2
New York	23.3	22.8	.5	42.7
North Carolina	.2	.2	(¹)	78.2
North Dakota	1.6	1.5	.1	71.2
Ohio	29.2	28.1	1.1	58.9
Oklahoma	.5	.5	(¹)	16.6
Oregon	.4	(¹)	.4	97.2
Pennsylvania	68.6	63.2	5.4	56.2
Rhode Island	10.7	10.6	.1	42.7
South Carolina	8.5	8.3	.2	24.7
South Dakota	1.6	1.6	(¹)	22.8
Tennessee	22.3	22.3	(¹)	18.7
Texas	50.6	50.6	(¹)	129.7
Utah	.5	.5	(¹)	123.6
Vermont	2.3	2.3	(¹)	8.0
Virginia	10.6	10.4	.2	5.7
Washington	4.8	4.8	(¹)	87.0
West Virginia	32.8	30.9	1.9	41.7
Wisconsin	1.5	1.4	.1	42.2
Wyoming	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	1.7
Hawaii	.6	.6	(¹)	(¹)

BRIDGES AND CULVERTS

State	Bridges				Culverts			
	New construction		Improvements		New construction		Improvements	
	Number	Length in feet	Number	Length in feet	Number	Length in feet	Number	Length in feet
Grand total	4,090	99,789	1,728	73,606	52,041	1,285,050	3,917	108,215
Continental United States	4,089	99,741	1,728	73,606	52,041	1,285,050	3,916	108,166
Alabama	106	2,044	1	90	58	2,369	(¹)	(¹)
Arizona	22	686	2	529	441	15,293	(¹)	(¹)
Arkansas	432	12,884	1	100	3,354	79,289	138	3,036
California	23	1,120	4	920	745	28,769	105	3,044
Colorado	67	2,180	17	900	962	24,493	2	128
Connecticut	5	108	2	214	315	11,639	52	1,163
Delaware	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
District of Columbia	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
Florida	43	796	2	1,835	113	3,890	5	80
Georgia	21	928	2	156	276	7,764	(¹)	(¹)
Idaho	71	2,191	28	940	459	8,151	17	638
Illinois	206	5,089	451	17,456	7,478	178,774	923	24,815
Indiana	29	781	109	6,354	2,069	57,877	76	3,926
Iowa	58	1,799	176	9,189	871	28,533	45	1,800
Kansas	25	1,151	(¹)	654	16,156	6	148	
Kentucky	313	6,638	47	1,056	5,890	153,939	(¹)	(¹)
Louisiana	2	80	(¹)	18	786	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
Maine	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	189	4,798	(¹)	(¹)
Maryland	2	38	(¹)	166	3,931	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
Massachusetts	2	42	5	123	56	3,151	105	2,168
Michigan	20	690	6	2,271	6,381	76,943	1	20
Minnesota	54	1,639	20	962	821	25,270	7	256
Mississippi	1,377	29,937	33	428	2,098	54,525	18	510
Missouri	8	239	4	682	811	22,352	54	1,551
Montana	48	1,087	40	784	277	8,490	23	684
Nebraska	145	2,642	425	10,243	783	23,272	59	1,622
Nevada	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	20	438	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
New Hampshire	3	71	1	50	227	7,579	113	2,634
New Jersey	12	367	2	403	22	750	3	1,426
New Mexico	350	3,700	(¹)	(¹)	59	1,499	6	108
New York	25	482	16	895	717	21,639	27	694
North Carolina	12	555	(¹)	(¹)	2,351	48,399	(¹)	(¹)
North Dakota	2	60	(¹)	(¹)	647	22,066	22	1,180
Ohio	21	325	(¹)	(¹)	575	19,949	110	10,794
Oklahoma	68	4,268	3	300	2,580	68,696	8	236
Oregon	24	708	3	60	504	16,650	620	11,991
Pennsylvania	34	890	5	872	1,307	20,815	204	4,143
Rhode Island	2	40	(¹)	(¹)	7	174	(¹)	(¹)
South Carolina	14	415	(¹)	(¹)	325	9,687	(¹)	(¹)
South Dakota	27	761	52	2,619	677	24,245	(¹)	(¹)
Tennessee	30	1,409	30	2,101	867	18,675		
Texas	262	7,330	199	8,065	649	17,105	1,058	27,071
Utah	18	466	6	100	441	11,990	62	1,210
Vermont	(¹)	(¹)	2	81	164	4,854	21	513

¹ No report received.

Physical accomplishment on W. P. A. highway, road, and street projects, completed between July 1 and Nov. 1, 1938—Continued

BRIDGES AND CULVERTS—continued

State	Bridges				Culverts			
	New construction		Improvements		New construction		Improvements	
	Number	Length in feet	Number	Length in feet	Number	Length in feet	Number	Length in feet
Virginia	9	249	1	600	46	1,354	1	30
Washington	8	607	23	834	2,959	88,442	1	60
West Virginia	64	1,671	1	13	1,515	38,332	18	314
Wisconsin	12	350	3	1,179	97	3,238	6	173
Wyoming	13	228	6	142	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
Hawaii	1	48	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	1	49

SIDEWALKS AND PATHS

State	New construction			Improvements, total miles
	Total miles	Miles of paved walks	Miles of unpaved walks	
Grand total	1,144.7	996.5	148.2	406.0
Continental United States	1,144.3	996.2	148.1	406.0
Alabama	8.2	8.0	.2	(¹)
Arizona	3.7	3.7	(¹)	(¹)
Arkansas	8.3	7.1	1.2	.3
California	35.7	27.6	8.1	4.9
Colorado	5.1	4.0	1.1	.1
Connecticut	44.0	39.5	4.5	3.1
Delaware	.1	.1	(¹)	(¹)
District of Columbia	.3	.3	(¹)	(¹)
Florida	3.8	2.5	1.3	2.4
Georgia	1.9	1.8	.1	.1
Idaho	8.6	6.4	2.2	(¹)
Illinois	158.0	145.9	12.1	125.7
Indiana	102.7	101.3	1.4	7.2
Iowa	4.4	4.0	.4	(¹)
Kansas	4.2	4.1	.1	.6
Kentucky	6.3	4.8	1.5	.6
Louisiana	15.4	15.4	(¹)	(¹)
Maine	4.0	1.6	2.4	3.6
Maryland	4.0	4.0	(¹)	.2
Massachusetts	98.5	93.9	4.6	77.5
Michigan	64.0	57.3	6.7	70.8
Minnesota	31.1	30.4	.7	.1
Mississippi	14.9	14.7	.2	7.3
Missouri	11.6	8.8	2.8	(¹)
Montana	1.4	.7	.7	(¹)
Nebraska	1.8	1.2	.6	.1
Nevada	.1	.1	(¹)	(¹)
New Hampshire	1.7	1.5	.2	.8
New Jersey	86.3	47.6	38.7	24.7
New Mexico	18.3	18.3	(¹)	(¹)
New York	51.2	49.8	1.4	33.7
North Carolina	34.8	26.3	8.5	(¹)
North Dakota	14.6	8.0	6.6	2.3
Ohio	29.4	22.6	6.8	4.4
Oklahoma	15.8	13.9	1.9	(¹)
Oregon	4.0	3.8	.2	1.4
Pennsylvania	51.9	42.1	9.8	11.5
Rhode Island	37.7	37.4	.3	(¹)
South Carolina	4.3	4.1	.2	2.1
South Dakota	10.0	10.0	(¹)	.1
Tennessee	10.5	1.6	8.9	(¹)
Texas	44.2	43.8	.4	2.8
Utah	10.5	7.5	3.0	9.0
Vermont	5.6	5.3	.3	2.7
Virginia	15.5	15.5	(¹)	(¹)
Washington	14.9	7.3	7.6	2.7
West Virginia	12.7	12.3	.4	3.3
Wisconsin	28.3	28.3	(¹)	(¹)
Wyoming	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)
Hawaii	.4	.3	.1	(¹)

¹ No report received.

² Less than 0.05 mile.

JUST A FEW SHORT SENTENCES

In conclusion, I should like my remarks to include a few short lines from a letter I received yesterday from one of the citizens of my district. The letter speaks for itself and speaks louder than I could speak or any other Member could speak on the floor of the House in urging two things: First, enough money for W. P. A. now to protect these people in their meager jobs; second, a sincere, earnest attack by the Congress at this session on this whole problem and the setting up of a stable program of employment which all will understand, from which this fear and uncertainty will be removed, on which at least somewhat better wages will be

paid and by means of which as much constructive work as possible will be done. Here is a part of the letter:

I enclose a clipping from this morning's Post. This is the kind of thing that is terrifying to those on W. P. A., the uncertainty of employment. It is a monster that keeps those on W. P. A. in constant dread. Can't something be done to take away this nightmare? I suppose those in authority fail to realize what effect this has on the lives of those who hope to be able to keep their families alive. If some of those in authority could see the budgets these people have to follow, their hearts might be touched.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with close attention and deep respect to the very clear and logical statement of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

My reaction to his plausible and logical arguments for a cut of \$150,000,000 in the W. P. A. appropriation is that while it would save the Treasury that amount of money in the next few months, it is, in my opinion, "a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy" that later will cost many times the sum thus temporarily saved.

It seems to me that if Congress adopts this resolution as presented that our action would be like that of a sick man who leaves the hospital a week too soon in order to save expense, suffers a relapse, and then is forced to spend several additional weeks in the hospital to regain the strength that might have come as a result of spending the additional week in the first place.

If this was pure speculation, I would not ask my colleagues to give it much consideration; but, my friends, we have had one experience with attempting to cut down on work relief, an experience for which we are now paying dearly for and will continue to pay.

It is my reasoned opinion that any attempt to cut work relief at this time is premature. Let us not make the same mistake twice. Let us go the last mile, as our distinguished colleague from Missouri suggests. Let us keep priming the pump until the return flow is sufficiently steady and adequate, in the form of increased private employment, to warrant the Government stepping out gradually.

I am just as anxious as the gentleman from Virginia to get the Government out of relief. In saying this I do not mean to infer that I am more humane than he is; more compassionate than he is; that I have a greater love for or more sympathy with poverty and suffering than he has. The fact is, we differ only as to time.

These are my reasons for opposing this cut.

I shall vote for replacing the \$150,000,000, thus bringing the appropriation up to \$875,000,000. In fact, my study of the situation leads me to the conclusion that a full billion dollars would not be too much at this critical period.

However, Colonel Harrington states that \$875,000,000 will suffice. The President recommends that sum; and since that seems to be the maximum we can secure, I shall vote for the original sum asked, namely, \$875,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WARREN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANHAM and Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Rev. Linus A. Lilly, S. J., regent of the school of law, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., commemorating Constitution Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein extracts from letters and telegrams in regard to the relief appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts from committees appointed by the Senate and the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein a table showing the physical accomplishments of the Works Progress Administration and also just a very few lines from a letter received by me from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from the president of Social Agencies, the chairman of Family Welfare and Relief, and the mayor of New Haven, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks made in Committee and to include therein a statement from the United States Conference of Mayors on the W. P. A. appropriation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIROVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a speech I delivered on the floor of the House at the last session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO WITHDRAW PAPERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request to withdraw papers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SACKS asks leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Silvio Bonanni, pending before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in the Seventy-fifth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARTER] may have unanimous consent to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include certain statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make a similar request as to myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, January 13, 1939, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

236. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend sections 7, 14, and 20 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States (49 Stat. 1807); to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

237. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

238. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act limiting expenditures for repairs or changes to naval vessels," approved July 18, 1935 (49 Stat. 482; 5 U. S. C. 468a), so as to increase the limit on expenditures for vessels and changes to any naval vessel during the second half of its life; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

239. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certified copy of several ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

240. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 16, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Indian River (Vero Beach), St. Johns River Waterway, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

241. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 16, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Southern Branch of Elizabeth River, Norfolk Harbor, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

242. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 19, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Hudson River at Ossining, N. Y., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted January 27, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

243. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 19, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and reexamination of Hulls Creek and Rogers Creek, Northumberland County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937, and requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted January 27, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

244. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 19, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Kenosha Harbor, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

245. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 16, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Necanicum River, Oreg., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

246. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 16, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Padanaram Harbor at South Dartmouth, Mass., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

247. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 16, 1938, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on reexamination of Old (Trinity) River, Tex., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted November 30, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

248. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting compilation of the preliminary examinations, surveys, and appropriations for works of river and harbor improvement authorized by the River and Harbor Acts approved July 3, 1930, and August 30, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

249. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Treasury of portions of the property within the military reservation known as the Morehead City Target Range, N. C.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 83. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939; without amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MASSINGALE:

H. R. 2371. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2372. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 2373. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PIERCE of Oregon:

H. R. 2374. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 2375. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEHRMANN:

H. R. 2376. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 2377. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 2378. A bill to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2379. A bill to provide that payment of adjusted-service credit may be made to the estate of the veteran if no eligible dependent is surviving; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2380. A bill to provide that 50 percent of Federal highway-aid funds shall be applied to secondary and feeder roads, including farm-to-market roads and rural free delivery mail routes; to the Committee on Roads.

H. R. 2381. A bill to appropriate funds for research in the production of peanuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 2382. A bill to amend section 704 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, and to amend section 706 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2383. A bill to increase further the efficiency of the Coast Guard by authorizing the retirement under certain conditions of enlisted personnel thereof with 20 or more years of service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2384 (by request). A bill to clarify the status of custodial employees in buildings operated by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 2385. A bill to place warrant officers of the Coast Guard in the same status with warrant officers of the Navy as to being commissioned chief warrant officers upon length of service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 2386 (by request). A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes," as amended, by extending the scope of services thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 2387. A bill to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and to regulate its value as provided in article I,

section 8, of the Constitution of the United States; to restore full employment and production; to prevent inflation and depression; and to provide a stable currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RISK:

H. R. 2388. A bill providing for the cancellation of certain charges for salvage operations conducted under section 20 of the River and Harbor Act of March 3, 1899; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 2389. A bill to make permanent the reduced interest rates on Federal land bank and land bank commissioner loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 2390. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render final judgment on any and all claims which the Yakima Indian Tribes may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 2391. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2392. A bill to amend the Social Security Act with respect to its application to employees of fraternal beneficiary societies, orders, and associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2393. A bill to provide for the free importation of flax-scutching machinery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2394. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with the State of Oregon in the preservation and maintenance of the battleship *Oregon* as a national memorial; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2395. A bill to amend paragraph (14) of subsection (a) of section 203 of the Motor Carrier Act, 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2396. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the completion of Bonneville Dam; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

H. R. 2397. A bill to authorize the distribution to persons admitted to citizenship of the patriotic poster entitled "Look the Truth in the Face"; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2398. A bill to amend section 4401 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the operation of private yachts on inland waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee:

H. R. 2399. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1935, to reduce the rate of interest to 3½ percent, to extend the time of maturity to 25 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2400. A bill to give certain civil-service employees of the War Department credit, under the Retirement Act of May 22, 1920, and such act as amended, for service rendered as telephone operators between March 1, 1918, and August 15, 1925, inclusive; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2401. A bill to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, approved February 28, 1925, and acts amendatory and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan:

H. R. 2402. A bill to abolish and correct unfair practices and substandard working conditions and to raise living standards among the employees of the United States Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. R. 2403. A bill to provide lower interest rates on loans made by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIROVICH:

H. R. 2404. A bill providing for a surgeon and ship hospital on vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2405. A bill to amend the Inland Waterways Corporation Act, approved June 3, 1924, as amended, authorizing the Secretary of War to extend the services and operations of the Inland Waterways Corporation to the Columbia River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DARDEN:

H. R. 2406. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the status of planners and estimators and progressmen of the field service of the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2407. A bill to amend section 118 of the Judicial Code to provide for the appointment of law clerks to United States district court judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALL:

H. R. 2408. A bill providing for the cancelation of certain charges for salvage operations conducted under section 20 of the River and Harbor Act of March 3, 1899; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 2409. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old-age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws; to establish a Social Security Board; to raise revenue; and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 2410. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of coal passers, firemen, firemen-custodians, assistant engineers, assistant engineer-custodians, engineers, and engineer-custodians who are engaged in the operation, maintenance, and repair of steam boilers and mechanical equipment and the supervision of custodial work in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2411. A bill transferring the jurisdiction, supervision, administration, and control over the salmon and other fisheries of Alaska, except the fur-seal and sea-otter fisheries, from the Department of Commerce to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2412. A bill to authorize the construction of a bulkhead along the water front of the town of Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 2413. A bill for the protection of the water supply of the city of Ketchikan, Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H. R. 2414. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to control emergency insect infestations on the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2415. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2416. A bill to authorize the establishment and maintenance of an experimental range in California for conducting research in the management of range lands for sheep grazing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2417. A bill to facilitate the control of soil erosion and/or flood damage originating upon lands within the exte-

rior of boundaries of the Sequoia National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PIERCE of Oregon:

H. R. 2418. A bill to extend the provisions of the Forest Exchange Act, as amended, to certain lands, so that they may become parts of the Whitman, Malheur, or Umatilla National Forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2419. A bill to provide for the rank and title of lieutenant general of the Regular Army for commanders of corps areas and foreign departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2420. A bill to provide for the naturalization of certain veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2421. A bill to incorporate the American National Institute (Prix de Paris) at Paris, France; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Texas:

H. R. 2422. A bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2423. A bill to establish a United States postgraduate Medical and Surgical College and Research Institute, to provide properly trained medical, surgical, and health personnel for the Military, Naval, and Public Health Services, to coordinate and improve health research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2424. A bill to establish the Breaks of Sandy National Park in Virginia and Kentucky; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2425. A bill to amend existing law to prevent denial of compensation for service-connected disability by reason of willful misconduct which did not interfere with full performance of duty during service; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PARSONS:

H. R. 2426. A bill authorizing the city of Shawneetown, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near a point between Washington Avenue and Monroe Street in said city of Shawneetown and a point opposite thereto in the county of Union and State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution providing additional funds for the expenses of the special joint congressional committee investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution to provide for a survey of the narcotic-drug conditions in the United States by the United States Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting employers from hiring child labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution to authorize the preparation of a comprehensive plan for controlling the floods, regulating the flow of waters, land reclamation, and conserving water for useful purposes in the basin of the Roanoke River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIROVICH:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the admission

to the status of citizens of a State the residents of the District constituting the seat of government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H. Res. 49. Resolution to provide additional compensation for a minority employee (Frank W. Collier); to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. Res. 50. Resolution creating a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the Works Progress Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KERR:

H. Res. 51. Resolution to pay a gratuity to William Duke Jones, son of the late Howard F. Jones; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of the George Waale Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2428. A bill for the relief of Allie F. Muth; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2429. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Suncrest Orchards, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2430. A bill for the relief of the Portland Iron Works; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2431. A bill for the relief of Multnomah County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2432. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Roy D. Cook, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2433. A bill for the relief of M. Seller & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 2434. A bill granting a pension to Florence G. Miller, widow of Capt. Edward Y. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2435. A bill for the relief of Helen Rauch and Max Rauch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 2436. A bill for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in Harding Town Site, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 2437. A bill granting a pension to Deana Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2438. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2439. A bill granting a pension to Clara Belle Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2440. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2441. A bill for the relief of Maj. Wilbur Rogers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2442. A bill granting a pension to Emma J. Fulton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2443. A bill granting a pension to Ella Manwarren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2444. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Galatro, parents of Michael Galatro, deceased minor son; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 2445. A bill granting a pension to Louise O. Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2446. A bill for the relief of Bridget Della Cawley Ebbole; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2447. A bill for the relief of Richard John Tomlin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 2448. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mertie Lorain Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 2449. A bill authorizing the President to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Harold R. Wood; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DARDEN:

H. R. 2450. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Herbert R. W. Lauterbach and others for overtime labor performed at the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., in excess of the legal day of 8 hours; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2451. A bill for the relief of Sarah Elizabeth Elliott, widow of Joseph Elliott deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2452. A bill for the relief of George Slade; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2453. A bill for the relief of the heirs at law of Barnabas W. Baker and Joseph Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 2454. A bill for the relief of Maggie E. Walters; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. R. 2455. A bill granting a pension to Bertha E. Haroff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2456. A bill granting a pension to Daniel F. Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2457. A bill for the relief of W. L. Toland; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2458. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. William M. Weatherford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT:

H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Emil V. Lehmann; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2460. A bill for the relief of L. W. Collins; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2461. A bill for the relief of Alfred T. Johnston; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2462. A bill for the relief of Emma A. Haessig Harte; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2463. A bill for the relief of William Estes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2464. A bill for the relief of Frank Tonin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2465. A bill granting a pension to Herman Acty; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2466. A bill to correct the military record of Granville B. Bryant; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2467. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to determine the claim of Madelena Carattini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLAHERTY:

H. R. 2468. A bill for the relief of John Raymond Sullivan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Daniel J. O'Neill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 2470. A bill granting a pension to Eliza Jane Wilkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2471. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Swander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH:

H. R. 2472. A bill granting a pension to Fred B. Tawes; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2473. A bill granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Kemp; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2474. A bill granting a pension to Mary B. Sherwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2475. A bill for the relief of Mrs. George E. Richardson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2476. A bill for the relief of Howard P. Bryan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON:

H. R. 2477. A bill granting a pension to Thomas J. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 2478. A bill for the relief of the Wisconsin Milling Co. and Wisconsin Telephone Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Martha Elizabeth Dry, widow of Frank Dry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 2480. A bill for the relief of the estate of John B. Brack; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2481. A bill for the relief of Pomeroy Parker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2482. A bill for the relief of Harry W. Boyd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2483. A bill for the relief of Louis Gershon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2484. A bill for the relief of James J. Orme; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEOD:

H. R. 2485. A bill granting a pension to Arminta B. Chestnut; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2486. A bill granting a pension to George Austin; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2487. A bill for the relief of Krikor Haroutunian; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2488. A bill for the relief of Michael Francis Spillane; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2489. A bill for the relief of Angie Ward; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2490. A bill for the relief of Fulton Combs; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2491. A bill granting a pension to Elbert Newberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2492. A bill granting a pension to Lizzie Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2493. A bill granting a pension to Lizzie Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2494. A bill granting a pension to Emily Jane Poe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2495. A bill for the relief of the heirs of the late Lawrence Conley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2496. A bill for the relief of Dewey Daniel; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2497. A bill granting a pension to Polly Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2498. A bill granting a pension to Lucinda McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2499. A bill granting a pension to Emaline Gambrel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2500. A bill granting a pension to Colonel L. Stacy; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2501. A bill granting a pension to Lillie Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2502. A bill granting a pension to Arvil Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2503. A bill granting a pension to Harrison Lykins; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2504. A bill granting a pension to Sarah Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2505. A bill granting a pension to Silas E. Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2506. A bill granting a pension to Perry Osborne; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2507. A bill granting a pension to Stephen Hays; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2508. A bill granting a pension to Minerva Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2509. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2510. A bill granting an increase of pension to Marnerva Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2511. A bill granting an increase of pension to Cynthia Conley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harris A. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2513. A bill for the relief of C. B. Reagh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 2514. A bill for the relief of G. E. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 2515. A bill granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Poust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2516. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Sturm; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2517. A bill granting a pension to Lulu Maude Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2518. A bill granting a pension to Anna L. Harman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 2519. A bill granting an increase of pension to Estline Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2520. A bill granting a pension to Carl H. Ziebell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SEGER:

H. R. 2521. A bill granting a pension to Carrie M. Gould; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIROVICH:

H. R. 2522. A bill for the relief of Dymtro or Jim Gural; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2523. A bill for the relief of Alfonsina Maurina Corradini; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2524. A bill for the relief of John Joseph Defeo; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 2525. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lizzie H. Webber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2526. A bill granting an increase of pension to Harriett Chamberlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2527. A bill for the relief of Sarah Daily; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 2528. A bill for the relief of James W. Kiplinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2529. A bill for the relief of W. F. Towson; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2530. A bill for the promotion and retirement of Capt. Taylor Branson, leader of the United States Marine Band; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

125. By Mr. BALL: Petition of the citizens of Pomfret Center, Conn., and vicinity, requesting that we adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and the act of May 1, 1937, and a resolution adopted by the Bridgeport Council of Catholic Women of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against lifting the embargo on arms to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

126. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition submitted by W. R. Green and 110 members of the veterans' Civilian Conservation Corps camp at Perryville, Mo., concerning pensions and advantages that would come to members of veterans' camps; to the Committee on Pensions.

127. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of Wild West Post, No. 91, Veterans of Foreign Wars, E. E. Hurd,

adjutant, Tacoma, Wash., pointing out that Congress has provided for the establishment of eight antiaircraft National Guard regiments in the United States, detailing the advantages of Tacoma as a prospective site for the establishment of such regiment, pointing out the proximity of the McChord Field (the Northwest Army air base) to Fort Lewis and Bremerton Navy Yard, and therefore urging that such regiment be established in Tacoma in Pierce County; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

128. Also, resolution of Veterans' Democratic Club of Washington, Inc., Rufus J. Hewes, secretary, Seattle, Wash., opposing the sale or shipment of material or goods that might be used as munitions of war from the United States to any country that has taken an aggressive position in the waging of declared or undeclared warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

129. Also, resolution of John R. Thompson Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Washington and Alaska, Z. S. Stark, adjutant, pointing out that Congress has provided for the establishment of eight antiaircraft National Guard regiments in the United States, detailing the advantages of Tacoma as a prospective site for the establishment of such regiment, pointing out the proximity of the McChord Field (the Northwest Army air base) to Fort Lewis and Bremerton Navy Yard, and therefore urging that such regiment be established in Tacoma in Pierce County; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

130. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the Young Men's Catholic Association of Boston, opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

131. Also, petition of St. Catherine's Guild of Professional Women of Boston, opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

132. Also, petition of the Catholic Alumni Sodality of Boston, opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

133. Also, petition of the Men's League Sodality of Boston, opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

134. Also, petition of the Catholic Nurses' Guild of Boston, opposing the lifting of the Spanish arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

135. By Mr. GEYER of California: Resolution of the Marine Cooks' and Stewards' Association of San Pedro, Calif. (Joseph O. Connor, secretary), requesting that the matter be taken before the Seventy-sixth Congress of building a marine hospital in San Pedro, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

136. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of L. J. Salz and others, relative to general policy of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

137. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of Knox, Ind., and vicinity, submitting a declaration of policy on the subject of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

138. By Mr. HAWKS: Petition of members of Holy Name Society of Beaver Dam, Wis., protesting against any change in the neutrality policy of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

139. Also, petition of 74 residents of Waukesha, Wis., protesting against any change in the present neutrality policy of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

140. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition of members of the Woman's Missionary Society of the Market Square Presbyterian Church, of Harrisburg, favoring retention of the embargo on munitions to countries engaged in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

141. By Mr. LANDIS: Petition of certain citizens of Sullivan, Ind., urging the continuation of Works Progress Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

142. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Allied Patriotic Societies, Inc., requesting that the present policy in force in this country, especially since the passage of the first quota law in 1921, of not excepting alien refugees from the restrictions on immigration, be firmly adhered to by Congress

as necessary to the protection of our own people, including millions of legally admitted immigrants, from the excessive injection of foreign elements difficult to assimilate, from greatly increased unemployment and from other political, social, and economic evils; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

143. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Burlington (Vt.) Women's Christian Temperance Union, seeking Federal legislation to prevent advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

144. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of the State Advisory Council of the Missouri State Employment Service, favoring the continuance of the United States Employment Service under the Wagner-Peyser Act within the Department of Labor as a distinct and separate service so that its identity will not be lost within some other governmental division; and that Congress appropriate to the United States Department of Labor funds sufficient to maintain an adequate United States employment service in cooperation with the States; to the Committee on Labor.

145. By Mr. SACKS: Petition of William J. Keyser and 28 others, favoring the continuation of the embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

146. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind., demanding the immediate trial and deportation of Harry Bridges and like undesirable aliens, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

147. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Petition of 143 members of Townsend Club, No. 1, Union City, Mich., urging passage of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

148. By Mr. THORKE: Resolution of the executive committee, Department of Montana, American Legion, reaffirming the action of the national convention at Los Angeles, relative to further appropriation for continuance of the Dies committee investigation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

149. Also, petition of the International Association of Fire Fighters, of Missoula, Mont., protesting against the retroactive application of any Federal tax upon the employees of the States and their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

150. Also, resolution of the Montana-Wyoming Beet Growers Association, protesting against any further reduction in the import duty on Cuban sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

151. Also, petition of Montana-Wyoming Beet Growers Association, requesting the Secretary of Agriculture that the amount due beet producers to be paid from the United States Treasury, under the terms of the 1937 Sugar Act, especially in producing areas having a long factory run, be made in two installments in essentially the following ratio: 70 percent immediately upon completion of delivery of all beets to the factory and the remaining 30 percent upon completion of the annual factory operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

152. Also, resolutions of the Montana-Wyoming Beet Growers Association, requesting remedial legislation to effectively regulate the quantity of sugar to be made available for consumption to the end that the domestic sugar industry may be maintained and farmers encouraged to continue to produce with reasonable assurance of a fair return for their labor (re Sugar Act of 1937, sec. 201, which provides the basis upon which the Secretary of Agriculture must determine the quantity of sugar necessary to be made available for consumption in any calendar year); to the Committee on Agriculture.

153. Also, petition of the Farmers Union of Pondera County, Mont., requesting enactment of a bushelage quota bill, in which all farmers shall be allotted an equal number of bushels and not according to his farm acreage; that this wheat have a set parity price at all times, based on 12 percent protein to protect protein differentials and that this

set parity price be adjusted to comparative freight rates and zones; to the Committee on Agriculture.

154. Also, petition of the Sons and Daughters of Montana Pioneers, of Great Falls, Mont., petitioning appropriation to assist in financing or to directly finance construction of an appropriate building for the Montana Historical Society and the Sons and Daughters of Montana Pioneers, in which historical data, records, and relics may be safely kept; also endorsing effort to preserve the ruins of Fort Benton as a historical site, and to make such replacements and restorations at old Fort Shaw as to render it a community hall for the Sun River Valley and a historic site and museum; to the Committee on the Library.

155. Also, resolution of the Clan-Na-Gael and Irish Republican War Veterans, of Butte, Mont., protesting against the use of the words "Northern Ireland," from the draft of the trade treaty between the United States and Great Britain; to the Committee on Printing.

156. Also, resolution of Local No. 367, Farmers Union, Sheridan County, Mont., petitioning that the base wheat acreage for Sheridan County, which has been reduced to 40 percent of cropland, be raised, so as to permit the raising of wheat on a greater percentage of the cropland; to the Committee on Agriculture.

157. Also, resolution of the United Mine Workers of America, District No. 27, Montana, protesting against the granting of the application of the Montana-Dakota Utilities Co., made to the Federal Power Commission, to import Canadian gas; also protesting against the granting of application made by the Montana-Dakota Utilities Co., to the railroad commissioners of the State of Montana to distribute the same in Montana; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

158. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Bridgeport Council of Catholic Women, Bridgeport, Conn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

159. Also, petition of J. G. Kramer, of Cullman, Ala., and others, petitioning consideration of their petition with reference to embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

160. Also, petition of Frank A. Hourihan, of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of his petition with reference to his constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 13, 1939

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we pray for Thy blessing upon the truth as it shall be spoken today; may it do good, excite thought, and lead us to do our whole duty. Oh, let us see the pitying Saviour in the city and in the desert place and transform all closed hearts. Let us hear the cry of the weary, feel the pulse of the struggling; haunt us with the thought of the homeless, and thus shall our love be perfected in stony places. Almighty God, let Thy will be done in our Nation. Make it strong, not for selfishness nor aggression but for those who seek liberty and sit in darkness. Help us to see ourselves; it is easier to be good in a garden than in the slum; it is easier to love God on the mountain peak than in the throes of poverty. Blessed Lord, the opportunity is ours; the door is open; lead us on. In the name of our Saviour.

Now we wait, Heavenly Father, and hear us. The clouds are low and forbidding. Again we stand on Jordan's banks and hear the sighing of the turbulent waves. One faithful and true in public and private life has left us. The other hour, when he breathed his last, the heavens opened and his manly soul became immortal. God bless his memory unto us and abide with great comfort and peace with his loved ones. In the blessed name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that Mr. WALSH, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. LODGE had been appointed as members on the part of the Senate of the Special Committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, created under Public Resolution 124, approved June 22, 1938.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's program and the legislative program, I be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and the legislative program, he may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a communication addressed to me by Mayor James R. Law, of Madison, Wis., president of the League of Wisconsin Municipalities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATIVE DIES, OF TEXAS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

REPRESENTATIVE DIES GIVEN AMERICANISM AWARD

NEW YORK, January 12.—The National Americanism Award Committee tonight announced Representative MARTIN DIES (Democrat), Texas, as the outstanding winner of its "Americanism award for 1938" for outstanding patriotic service.

DIES is chairman of the House Committee Investigating Un-American Activities.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ask the majority leader a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, several on this side desire to ascertain, if they can, what the legislative program will be for next week. They want to make their plans accordingly.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the committees, of course, have not been named as yet. The general committees, I think, will not be able to report legislation next week. As to what the Committee on Appropriations will be ready to do, I would rather have the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] answer the inquiry.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we have a number of very urgent deficiency items which have been sent up by the Bureau of the Budget, which the deficiency subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations will take up on Monday next and hold hearings on. I hope that they may be ready for presentation to the House on Thursday next. We should be able to dispose of them in 1 day.

Mr. MAPES. Then it is safe to say that no important legislation will be up before Thursday?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes; as far as I can answer the inquiry.

Mr. RAYBURN. There will be no other legislation until the Appropriations Committee reports.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I should say that it is barely possible that we could get the deficiency items before the House on Wednesday. I would not like to foreclose myself, though my judgment is that it will not be until Thursday.